

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA



THESIS

**THE BRITISH-IRA PRENEGOTIATIONS
AND THE EFFECT OF
UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT**

by

Sean Michael O'Donovan

March 1996

Thesis Advisor:

James Wirtz

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

19960724 059

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (<i>Leave blank</i>)	2. REPORT DATE	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED	
	March 1996	Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE THE BRITISH-IRA PRENEGOTIATIONS AND THE EFFECT OF UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT.		5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) O'Donovan, Sean Michael			
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey CA 93943-5000		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.			
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (<i>maximum 200 words</i>) With the end of the Cold War and of the predictability of bi-polar power arrangements, the opportunity to shape global security has arisen. As the sole remaining superpower the United States has an opportunity and probably a requirement to attempt to shape this new international environment. As new conflicts arise and old ones continue nations try to negotiate to solve these problems diplomatically. To facilitate negotiations a phase of prenegotiation takes place to try to get the parties to the negotiating table. This thesis uses the British-IRA prenegotiations to examine this process and to explore the role the United States can and should play in international conflict resolution. The case is studied using prenegotiation and negotiation theory, which is reviewed in Chapter II. The current British-IRA prenegotiations process is examined along with the role the United States has played. Despite British objections the United States has gotten involved in facilitating the talks, often benefitting the IRA-Sinn Fein side. This has had a negative effect on the British-U. S. relations, but the overall effect has been positive, forcing the issue and moving the prenegotiations towards formal negotiations.			
14. SUBJECT TERMS Negotiation, Prenegotiation, Ireland, Irish Republican Army		15. NUMBER OF PAGES <u>86</u>	
		16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18 298-102

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

**THE BRITISH-IRA PRENEGOTIATIONS
AND THE EFFECT OF
UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT**

Sean Michael O'Donovan
Lieutenant, United States Navy
B.A., Villanova University, 1988

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
March 1996

Author:

Sean M. O'Donovan

Sean Michael O'Donovan

Approved by:

James Wirtz

James Wirtz, Thesis Advisor

Cynthia Levy

Cynthia Levy, Second Reader

Frank M. Teti

Frank M. Teti, Chairman

Department of National Security Affairs

ABSTRACT

With the end of the Cold War and of the predictability of bi-polar power arrangements, the opportunity to shape global security has arisen. As the sole remaining superpower the United States has an opportunity and probably a requirement to attempt to shape this new international environment. As new conflicts arise and old ones continue nations try to negotiate to solve these problems diplomatically. To facilitate negotiations a phase of prenegotiation takes place to try to get the parties to the negotiating table. This thesis uses the British-IRA prenegotiations to examine this process and to explore the role the United States can and should play in international conflict resolution. The case is studied using prenegotiation and negotiation theory, which is reviewed in Chapter II. The current British-IRA prenegotiations process is examined along with the role the United States has played. Despite British objections the United States has gotten involved in facilitating the talks, often benefitting the IRA-Sinn Fein side. This has had a negative effect on the British-U. S. relations, but the overall effect has been positive, forcing the issue and moving the prenegotiations towards formal negotiations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. QUESTION	1
B. THEORY	2
C. RELEVANCE	4
D. METHODOLOGY	5
E. LIMITATIONS	7
II. THEORY	9
A. TRIGGERS	10
B. STAGES	12
C. FUNCTIONS	13
D. NORTHERN IRELAND AND PRENEGOTIATIONS	16
III. HISTORY	17
A. ANCIENT HISTORY	17
B. INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENTS	19
C. NEGOTIATIONS AND CEASE-FIRES	27
IV. PRENEGOTIATIONS	31
A. TALKS ABOUT TALKS	31
B. DOWNING STREET DECLARATION	34
C. CLARIFICATION	36
D. THE UNITED STATES GETS INVOLVED	38
E. END OF VIOLENCE	46
F. DELAYS	53
G. THE UNITED STATES'S GROWING ROLE	55
V. CONCLUSION	61
APPENDIX A. CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS	69
APPENDIX B. PARTICIPANTS	71
APPENDIX C. ANGLO-IRISH AGREEMENT	73
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	75

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

With the end of the Cold War and the stability of bi-polar power arrangements, the opportunity to shape global security has emerged. As the sole remaining superpower, the United States has an opportunity to shape this new international environment. As new conflicts arise and old ones continue, nations try negotiation to solve these diplomatically. To facilitate negotiations, a phase of prenegotiation often takes place to move the parties to the negotiating table.

Prenegotiation theory is a somewhat new field of study. This thesis uses the British-IRA prenegotiations to examine this process and to explore the role the United States can and should play in international conflict resolution.

Prenegotiation theory focuses on three aspects: the stages, functions, and triggers of the prenegotiation process. The functions and triggers for involvement effect the results of the actual negotiations. The case of the British-IRA prenegotiations, the talks fit well into prenegotiation theory, but when looking at the problems in Northern Ireland the history of the conflict needs to be considered.

The history of the problems surrounding the creation of a free and unified Ireland reveals the difficulties that the present day negotiators face. There has not been a united Ireland under an Irish leader since 1014 and in more modern times the first time the south was given autonomy, 1921, a civil war broke out. The history since then has been filled with bloodshed caused by paramilitaries

and governments on both sides of the issue of a united Ireland. The last 25 years have seen two concentrated terrorist campaigns. One of these waged by the Republican groups, the IRA being the largest and most well known, is aimed at driving the British out of Ireland. The other campaigns being waged by the Loyalist paramilitaries and it is aimed at the Republicans and its goal is to keep the status quo in Northern Ireland.

The recent developments mark a decided change in the way the sides are dealing with the problems in Northern Ireland. The cease-fire of August 1994, which occurred in the wake of the Downing Street Declaration, is the longest and most complete end to hostilities that Ireland has seen since 1916. The process of prenegotiations that preceded and followed the cease-fire will have an impact on formal negotiations scheduled to begin in February 1996.

From the very beginning the United States has played a role in this prenegotiation process and this has had several side effects. Because the British Government did not want America's interference it has had a negative effect on the British-U.S. Government's relationship. The overall effect has been positive, especially for the Sinn Fein and IRA. The United States has forced the issue and moved the prenegotiations towards formal negotiations. The problem for the United States is that its presence seems necessary to keep the process going.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. QUESTION

Today the major threats to international stability are regional conflicts. One of these conflicts is in Northern Ireland. Negotiations aimed at ending this conflict are set to begin in February 1996. Getting to this point was a complex process. This thesis asks whether the United States had an affect on the peace process in Northern Ireland.

The conflict in Northern Ireland supplies an opportunity to examine how the United States can best intervene to bring regional conflicts to the negotiating table. The troubles in Ireland have been going on for hundreds of years. The longevity of this conflict makes it difficult to solve. If we can understand how this conflict reached the negotiating table, then the process that enabled this to occur might can be applied to other situations.

The American involvement took place during the prenegotiations. Prenegotiation is defined as a process that is analytically distinct and prior to negotiation.¹ Prenegotiations that lead to negotiations are important because formal negotiation is the best policy for parties in an internal conflict.² This thesis seeks to use

¹ Janice Stein, The Process of International Prenegotiation: Getting To The Table, (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989) p. XI.

² I. William Zartman, "Dynamics and Constraints in Negotiations in Internal Conflicts," Elusive Peace: Negotiating An End To Civil Wars, (Washington, D.C., The Brookings Institution, 1995); p. 5.

prenegotiation theory as an explanation of the role the United States played in the process of getting to the negotiating table.

B. THEORY

Recently, negotiation theorists and practitioners alike have recognized the importance of investigating the conditions and processes that encourage parties in conflict to consider negotiation. Harold Sanders, I William Zartman, and Janice Stein have all called for a broader theory of negotiation that encompasses the processes that permit parties involved in a protracted conflict to agree to negotiate.³ In the book Janice Stein edited, The Process of International Prenegotiation: Getting To The Table, prenegotiation theory is explored.

The prenegotiation process involves negotiations about negotiations. The prenegotiation process defines the boundaries, shapes the agenda, and affects the outcome of negotiations.⁴ The process begins when one or more conflicting parties consider negotiation as a policy option to solve their dispute, and continues through four stages until formal negotiations are reached, or one or more of the parties decide

³ Harold Sanders, "The Pre-Negotiation Phase," in D.B. Bendahmane and J.W. McDonald Jr, eds International Negotiation: Art and Science, (Washington: Foreign Service Institute, Department of State, 1984) I William Zartman and Maureen R. Bergman, The Practical Negotiator, (New Haven: Yale university Press, 1982) Janice Stein, "Getting to the Table: The Triggers, Stages Functions, and Consequences of Prenegotiation," Janice Stein, ed, The Process of International Prenegotiation: Getting To The Table, (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989)

⁴ Stein, Getting To The Table, p. XI.

not to negotiate.⁵ There are several types of “triggers” that can cause the initial move toward prenegotiations. Crisis avoidance and reassessment after a crisis often motivate groups to consider negotiations as an option. Also, long-term policy failure or changes in long-standing conditions are triggers for prenegotiation. The more of these conditions that are met the more likely it is that prenegotiations will commence.⁶

Prenegotiations not only help start negotiations, but also affect the outcome of formal negotiations. Prenegotiations often help to determine the participants in the talks. Prenegotiations also allow the parties to come to terms with the costs and access the risk involved in getting involved in negotiations. This period allows the negotiators to bolster domestic support, and search for alternatives.⁷ Setting the agenda and establishing a framework are also important tasks often accomplished during prenegotiation. The agenda and framework have the most impact on the success of the follow-on formal negotiations.⁸ How the British-IRA negotiations fit into this theory is covered in the next chapter.

⁵ Harold Saunders, “We need a Larger Theory of Negotiation: The Importance of Pre-negotiating Phases,” *Negotiating Journal*, 1 July 1985, p. 249-262.

⁶ I. William Zartman, “Common Elements in the Analysis of the Negotiation Process,” *Negotiation Journal*, 4 January 1988, p. 31.

⁷ I. William Zartman, “Prenegotiations: Phases and Functions,” in Janice Stein, ed. The Process of International Prenegotiation: Getting To The Table, (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989):p. 1-17.

⁸ Stein, Getting To The Table, p. 237-268.

C. RELEVANCE

The world is beset by severe and protracted local and international conflicts that appear unsolvable. These conflicts can destroy hundreds of thousands of lives and cause billions of dollars of damage. Even localized internal conflicts take a terrible toll in lives. The victims of the Basque independence movement in Spain number over 900 since 1959⁹ and in Northern Ireland, the IRA caused the deaths of over 1000 people since 1980¹⁰ and a total of over 3100 since the troubles began in 1969.¹¹ Traditional approaches to conflict management have proven ineffective and the parties involved continue to use strategies of threat, intimidation and violence to gain their goals. Discussions that facilitate the decision to move into prenegotiations or from prenegotiations into negotiations have a useful influence. These prenegotiations in turn will improve both the probabilities of negotiations occurring and the likelihood of success.¹² Two thirds of internal conflicts that occur, end with one of the parties surrendering or being eliminated. These groups or movements often go underground

⁹ Cyrus Ernesto Zirakzadeh, A Rebellious People: Basques, Protests and Politics, (University of Nevada Press, 1991)

¹⁰ Tim Pat Coogan, The IRA: A History, (Colorado, Roberts Rinehart Publishers, 1994); Appendix I.

¹¹ James F. Clarity, "Both Sides Discuss Path Towards Talks," *New York Times*, 1 February 1994, p. A7.

¹² Ronald J. Fisher, "Prenegotiation Problem-solving Discussions: Enhancing the Potential for Successful Negotiation," in Janice Stein ed, The Process of International Prenegotiation: Getting To The Table, (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989); p. 207.

only to reemerge and reignite the conflict. The best chance to end internal conflicts is through negotiation.¹³

President Clinton explained that solving regional and internal conflicts is one of his administration's goals when he commented on the Bosnian crisis. "America cannot be the world's policeman. We cannot stop all war for all time, but we can stop some wars. We cannot save all women and all children but we can save many of them. We can't do everything but we must do what we can do."¹⁴ United States help in solving these conflicts diplomatically is not only beneficial for the international community, but beneficial for the global standing of the United States. It also helps the United States military avoid the use of our forces where they are not appropriate for the type of mission and may not be wanted.

D. METHODOLOGY

The task of determining how much pressure and influence the United States used and its effect on parties involved in the British-IRA prenegotiations involves several steps. The first is to explain the theory behind the prenegotiation process.

The historical conflict involving Irish nationalism influences the goals of the prenegotiation process. The history of the conflict also illuminates what must be overcome to realize the goals of the prenegotiations. No study of Irish politics can be

¹³ Zartman, Elusive Peace: Negotiating An End To Civil Wars, p. 3-29.

¹⁴ Alison Mitchell, "Clinton Lays Out His Case For U.S. Troops in Balkans; 'We Must Do What We Can,'" *New York Times*, 28 November 1995, p. A1.

complete without reference to the belief's and history of the Irish people.¹⁵ It is also important to examine previous attempts at negotiating a solution to the troubles in Northern Ireland to better examine why this instance has been more successful.

The British-IRA prenegotiation process can be scrutinized to study the American ability to get parties to the negotiation table. Comparing the actual prenegotiation process to prenegotiation theory validates the explanation of U.S. involvement and its effect. The way the United States pushed the prenegotiations along and kept the process on track is then easy to evaluate. There are also long-term effects and unexpected side effects of United States' intervention that are examined. When these are understood the implications for future conflict resolution through American--sponsored negotiations can be explored and the question this thesis asks--did the United States have an affect on the peace process in Northern Ireland can be answered.

The scholarly literature dealing with prenegotiations is produced by a select cadre of negotiation theorists and practitioners. Many of these works deal with case studies of other conflicts where the prenegotiation process has been attempted. The literature about Irish history is plentiful and there are many works dealing with the IRA and the Northern Ireland problem. The information dealing with the prenegotiation process is taken from a varied number of sources. *The New York Times* and *The Irish Times* have both been covering the prenegotiations very closely. The Foreign

¹⁵ D. George Boyce, Nationalism in Ireland, (London, Routledge, 1991); p. 12.

Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and several on-line services also provide extensive and detailed information about the current talks.

E. LIMITATIONS

The formal all-party negotiations to discuss the Northern Ireland problem are set to begin in February 1996. There have been other formal negotiations that fell through at the last minute. As long as the situation in Northern Ireland does not devolve to violence and the talks continue the process is considered successful.

The British-IRA prenegotiation is a single case study, but it is an exemplary one to use for several reasons. The nationalistic nature of the conflict is similar to several other conflicts, for example the Basque movement in Spain. The ETA, the Basque separatist group, has been using terrorist tactics to try to break away provinces from Spain.¹⁶ Like the British-IRA case, the Spanish government will not negotiate with the ETA unless it abandons its campaign of violence. Also, a 1989 ETA cease-fire similar to the present IRA one collapsed due to lack progress in the negotiations.¹⁷ The Northern Ireland case is also of interest because it is an old conflict that has to overcome centuries of history prior to reaching the negotiating table.

¹⁶ Robert P. Clark, Negotiating With ETA: Obstacles to Peace in the Basque Country, 1975-1988, (University of Nevada Press, 1990)

¹⁷ Robert P. Clark, "Negotiations for Basque, Self-Determination in Spain," in I. William Zartman, ed, Elusive Peace: Negotiating An End To Civil Wars, (Washington, D.C., The Brookings Institution, 1995); p. 59-76.

In Chapter II prenegotiation theory is explored and explained. In Chapter III the relevant Irish history concerning the roots of the conflict in Northern Ireland is reviewed along with the previous attempts at negotiations. Chapter IV contains the chronology of the present prenegotiation process and compares it to the theory. Looking at these events, the immediate effects American involvement had on the prenegotiations are identified. Chapter V concludes by looking at the ramifications of answering the question, did the United States have an affect on Northern Ireland?

II. THEORY

“Negotiation, not war, is the most appropriate means of managing internal conflict.”¹⁸ Yet negotiations are not easy to carry out and achieving the appropriate conditions favoring negotiations is difficult.¹⁹ The process of prenegotiation helps create the conditions needed for formal negotiations. The literature on negotiations is extensive. The study of prenegotiations is a newer and smaller field of study than negotiation theory with fewer scholarly writings on the subject.

While Northern Ireland is a good case study, no two cases are the same and the lessons of history are often inconsistent and generalizations are hazardous if not carefully qualified.²⁰ The use of theory, “accounts for variance in historical outcomes; it clarifies apparent inconsistencies and contradictions among the lessons of different cases by identifying the critical conditions and variables that differed from one case to the other.”²¹ By using a structured and focused comparison to evaluate theory, a single

¹⁸.I. William Zartman, “Conclusions: The Last Mile,” in Elusive Peace: Negotiating An End To Civil Wars, p. 332-346.

¹⁹ Ibid. p. 333.

²⁰ Alexander L. George, “Case Studies and Theory Development: The Method of Structured, Focused Comparison,” in Paul Gordon Lauren, ed, Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory, and Policy, (New York, The Free Press, 1979) p. 43-68.

²¹ Ibid. p. 44.

case study can contribute to that theoretical field of study.²² This thesis tries to do this using the British-IRA prenegotiations.

Several questions must be asked when discussing prenegotiation theory.²³ How do prenegotiations begin? Why do leaders consider the option of prenegotiation? What are the stages of prenegotiation and are they distinct from negotiation? When do prenegotiations culminate at the negotiating table and why?²⁴ What are the effects of prenegotiation on the follow-on negotiations and their outcome.

A. TRIGGERS

Why do prenegotiations begin? Why do nations, nongovernmental organizations (NGO's), political parties, rebels, or terrorist organizations attempt to get to the negotiation table to find a diplomatic solution to any particular conflict, armed or otherwise?²⁵ One of the most common reasons prenegotiation are considered as a policy option is an event or change in conditions that causes a reassessment of alternatives and adds negotiations to the strategies for conflict management.²⁶ This

²² Ibid. p. 61-63.

²³ Janice G. Stein, "Getting to the Table: The Triggers, Stages, Functions, and Consequences of Prenegotiation," Getting To The Table: The Process of International Prenegotiation, p. 239-268.

²⁴ Raymond Cohen, Negotiating Across Cultures: Communication Obstacles in International Diplomacy, (Washington D.C., United States Institute of Peace Press, 1991) p. 50.

²⁵ Stein, "Getting to the Table," p. 239-268.

²⁶ Zartman, "Common Elements in the Analysis of the Negotiation Process," p. 31.

often occurs after a crisis or when trying to avoid a pending crisis. The end of the cold war is such a basic change in the international political arena: almost anything that occurs in the first few years afterward, to a degree reflects the dynamics of the new international system.²⁷

Another reason prenegotiations begin is due to broad policy failures that are often accompanied by a perception of opportunity.²⁸ Crisis avoidance or the perception of a new threat is also a reason that many parties decide to attempt to negotiate.²⁹ When this is coupled with the perception of an opportunity, a broad policy failure is even more likely to lead to prenegotiations.

Another reason that a party looks to enter into prenegotiation is domestic political pressure.³⁰ This could cover a large range of possible causes for the pressure and it could come from many different sources within the domestic arena.

The reasons for entering into the prenegotiation process can be varied. The cause for trying to get to the table can play an important role in the outcome of the formal negotiations. Often it is important to keep the reason for seeking prenegotiations a question in the minds of the other parties. If the other groups in the negotiation know

²⁷ Zartman, “Conclusions: The Last Mile,” p. 332-346

²⁸ Stein, “Getting to the Table,” p. 240.

²⁹ Zartman, “Common Elements in the Analysis of the Negotiation Process,” p. 31-43.

³⁰ Stein, “Getting to the Table,” p. 239-268.

that an organization is entering negotiations because it has no other options, then the upper hand belongs to those with options left.³¹

B. STAGES

Many negotiation theorists do not look at specifically prenegotiation or they integrate prenegotiation into a model of negotiation. This masks the important analytic differences and blurs the distinction between the prenegotiation process and the negotiation process.³² One model, proposed by Harold Saunders, does have stages in which certain tasks are accomplished that relate to the functions of the prenegotiation process. In this model, getting to the formal negotiations is final stage which is effected by those preceding it.³³ Another facet of this model is that it allows for the parties not to all have to be in the same stage of prenegotiations as the other parties involved are. This model also provides a standardized set of questions that is necessary for a controlled comparison required when using a single case study.³⁴ Because this model provides the required elements to examine a single case study it is being used in this thesis on the British-IRA prenegotiations.

The first stage in the Saunders model is a diagnostic phase where the parties come to have a shared definition of the problem. The second stage occurs when the

³¹ Zartman, "Conclusions: The Last Mile," p. 333-336.

³² Stein, "Getting to the Table," p. 239-268.

³³ Saunders, "We need a Larger Theory of Negotiation," p. 249-262.

³⁴ George, "Case Studies and Theory Development," in Diplomacy, p. 62.

parties commit to a negotiated settlement and conclude that a fair settlement is possible. The third stage, and the last before formal negotiations begin, is arranging the negotiation or setting the framework.

C. FUNCTIONS

Prenegotiations serve seven important functions and purposes. Some of these are in relation to the formal negotiations and others are important on their own.³⁵ Those functions that deal with the formal negotiations that follow can have an important impact on the final resolution of the conflict. Whether or not the negotiation even takes place often is determined on how well these functions are carried out during the prenegotiations.³⁶

The process of prenegotiations has to do with setting the stage for negotiations. Determining the participants of those negotiations is one of the most basic functions. Determining the participants of a prenegotiation also may include setting conditions that have to be satisfied before parties are accepted by the other negotiators and allowed meet face to face at the table.³⁷ This is a very important part of British-IRA prenegotiations that will be explored in Chapter IV. Determining who is not going to be invited to negotiations can also be important. In a negotiation, certain parties can

³⁵ Zartman, "Prenegotiations: Phases and Functions," p.1-17.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Stein, "Getting to the Table," p. 239-268.

cause too much disruption or the collapse of the entire proceedings just with their presence.³⁸

The next two functions play different and important roles in the prenegotiation process. One is the setting of boundaries on what is to be discussed or a structure to follow during the prenegotiations and into the negotiations. The second is setting the agenda for negotiations.³⁹ The boundary setting gives limits on actions and decisions mostly during the prenegotiation phase. Agenda setting determines what *will* be discussed during the formal phase. Setting the agenda is a powerful tool because it limits what is going to be the subject of the talks. It also increases the chance of a successful resolution to the conflict when a fairly well set agenda is established before the negotiations begin. Setting the agenda early reduces uncertainty and complexity by establishing what will be, and what will not be on the negotiating table.⁴⁰ Agenda setting also helps by not diverting time and energy away from the formal negotiations.

This period of prenegotiation provides the parties with an opportunity to widen domestic support, or sometimes create it. This is part of the function of assessing the risks while limiting the political costs of getting involved in negotiations, due to the lack of commitment entailed in prenegotiation. Assessing risks personal to international is very important for the negotiator who desires to remain in a position to continue to

³⁸ Janice G. Stein, "Prenegotiation in the Arab-Israeli Conflict: The Paradoxes of Success and Failure," Getting To The Table: The Process of International Prenegotiation p. 174-205.

³⁹ Stein, "Getting to the Table," p. 239-268.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

negotiate.⁴¹ This is also a period when a group can try to gain support from within the other side's government or organization using the proverbial logic, "the enemy of my enemy is my ally." Testing the support is even more important for elected governments, but this period is also when opposition parties within ones own government can be cultivated by the other side of the prenegotiation.⁴²

The prenegotiation is a very good testing period for several other important policy options that will not only affect the prenegotiation but the follow-on negotiations. Some of these have to do with negotiating techniques and others have to do with political risks. The give-and-take that occurs during a prenegotiation provides a great opportunity to test reciprocity without formal commitment to an agreement.⁴³ Also the other party's negotiation style can be observed, such as how they use the media or how firm their positions tend to be.

The next function of prenegotiations is one of the most important, it is searching for or testing alternatives. This helps to set the boundaries and define the parameters. This will eventually lead to a framework that has already been meditated by the parties. This all occurs with limited risk because no commitment to formal negotiations has been made.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Zartman, "Prenegotiations: Phases and Functions," p.1-17.

⁴² I. William Zartman and Maureen R Bergman, The Practical Negotiator, p 78.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Stein, "Getting to the Table," p. 239-268.

The more of these functions that can be accomplished before the start of formal negotiations the smoother the negotiations will go and the higher the probability of a successful outcome.

D. NORTHERN IRELAND AND PRENEGOTIATIONS

When applying the prenegotiation theory to Northern Ireland; many different governments and organizations are involved; their motive for negotiating are important. The final stage of the prenegotiations will occur when ministerial level negotiations take place with all the concerned parties.⁴⁵ Many functions of the prenegotiation process are completed in this case and the most important aspect for success, a solid framework for the formal negotiations, is in place. By comparing the case of Northern Ireland to the existing prenegotiation theory this thesis is a structured, focused comparison. It is structured on prenegotiation theory and focused on the certain aspects of this historical case.⁴⁶ By doing this it can contribute to prenegotiation theory reformulation dealing the effect of United States involvement on the prenegotiation process.

⁴⁵At the present time, 1 December 1995, two tier talks are being considered where the two main belligerent sides do not attend the same talks. Instead the British and Irish governments will be hold two separate negotiations, one with the Protestant groups and one with the Catholic groups.

⁴⁶ George, "Case Studies and Theory Development," in Diplomacy, p. 62-63.

III. HISTORY

A survey of the history of Ireland is required to appreciate the complexity of the conflict which British-IRA prenegotiations had to overcome.⁴⁷ An examination of the Irish nationalistic, or Republican, movement and a look at the other attempts at negotiating a solution to the troubles in Ulster also will illuminate the difficulties surrounding these prenegotiations. These earlier failures at a negotiated solution in Northern Ireland will help illustrate the United States involvement has been critical to the current success.

A. ANCIENT HISTORY

The only time Ireland has been united was in 1014 when Brian Boru, the High King of Ireland, drove the Vikings back into the sea at the Battle of Clontarf.⁴⁸ This respite from conflict did not last because Brian was killed in his camp as his soldiers celebrated their victory. His son and grandson were both killed in battle leaving no heir to the throne. This united Ireland lasted only one day before falling back into a system of clan ruled provinces and conflict.⁴⁹ This episode in Irish history highlights the difficulties that have been encountered trying to create a united Ireland.

⁴⁷ Boyce, Nationalism in Ireland, p. 12.

⁴⁸ Donald H. Akenson, The United States and Ireland, (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1973) p. 11.

⁴⁹ Maire and Coner Cruise O'Brien, A Concise History of Ireland, (New York, Thames and Hudson, 1985) p. 37.

The conflict with the British over the ownership of Ireland began in 1169 with the invasion of English mercenaries. This invasion was at the request of the King of Leinster, to aide him in his fight against other Irish kings.⁵⁰ The struggles continued until 1601 when the leading Irish chiefs were defeated in the Battle of Kinsale and stripped of their power.⁵¹ They later fled to Europe in 1607 leaving behind their lands and a dejected population. King James I handed over the land in north-eastern Ireland to Scottish settlers called “Undertakers.” Other parts of Ireland were given over to “Planters” to oversee, but only in the north were both landlords and tenants displaced, making colonization more complete.⁵² This act set up some of the basis for the subsequent conflict based on cultural, language and, most importantly, religious differences between the colonists and the indigenous population.

The religious differences continued to be the main source of conflict because the English were Anglicans and the Scottish were Presbyterians, while the Irish were overwhelmingly Catholic. The same religious wars that affected England during this period affected Ireland as well. When the throne of England changed from Protestant to Catholic, the Irish people’s will for independence tended to manifest itself in rebellion.⁵³ When James II was deposed by William of Orange he fled to Ireland only to be

⁵⁰ Robert W. White, Provisional Irish Republicans, An Oral and Interpretive History, (Westport, Greenwood Press, 1993) p. 13.

⁵¹ O’Brien, A Concise History of Ireland, p. 60.

⁵² Tim Pat Coogan, The IRA: A History, (Colorado, Robert Rinehart Publishers) 1994, p. 4.

⁵³ Robert Kee, Ireland: A History, (Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1982) p. 47-48.

defeated by William at the battle of Boyne 14 June 1690.⁵⁴ Some of the Irish troops that had supported James I continued to fight for more than a year after the battle before fleeing for France. The Protestant conquest was now complete leaving a population and overseers that had a deep hatred towards each other.⁵⁵

B. INDEPENDENCE MOVEMENTS

In 1795 a young Protestant, Wolfe Tone, attempted to end the existing exploitation of Catholic peasants by writing a pamphlet, *An Argument on the Behalf of the Catholics in Ireland*.⁵⁶ His goal was to unite Catholics and Protestants in the cause of Irish separation.⁵⁷ This led to the creation of societies of "United Irishmen" who attempted to throw off the yoke of English rule by rebelling. The failure of this revolt cost Tone his life and caused a crackdown from the British Crown.⁵⁸ Tone became one of the most important Irish martyrs and his idea of a revolution that united Catholics and Protestants would inspire subsequent nationalists.⁵⁹ Another result of Tones uprising is

⁵⁴ White, Provisional Irish Republicans, p.15-16.

⁵⁵ O'Brein, A Concise History of Ireland p. 76.

⁵⁶ Coogan, The IRA: A History, p. 4.

⁵⁷ Daniel J. O'Neil, Three Perennial Themes of Anti-Colonialism: The Irish Case, (Colorado, University of Denver, 1976) p. 26.

⁵⁸ Coogan, The IRA: A History, p. 5.

⁵⁹ O'Neil, Three Perennial Themes of Anti-Colonialism: The Irish Case, p. 26.

that the British Government decided to better integrate Ireland into the United Kingdom.⁶⁰

The Act of Union, written in 1800, created a law that linked Ireland to England, to the detriment of Ireland, by creating The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. Ireland was no longer allowed a self-governing body due to the Act Of Union.⁶¹ English termination of self-rule in Ireland would become a common practice during any period of troubles. The Act of Union had other effects on Ireland other than those in reaction to the legal joining of the Britain and Ireland. For example, a segment of the population within Ireland became dedicated to destroying the Act of Union and what it stood for through armed force.⁶² This segment gave birth to rebellions in 1803, by Robert Emmet, in 1848 by the Young Irelanders, and in 1867 by the Fenians. The descendants of the Fenians, the Irish Republican Brotherhood then revolted, in 1916.⁶³ The second effect that the passage of the Act of Union had was it caused the growth of a constitutional movement to repeal the Act and institute Home Rule for Ireland.⁶⁴

Between the years 1841 and 1951 Ireland lost 2 million people. About one million died while the other million emigrated; many to the United States. The emigrants

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ O'Brien, A Concise History of Ireland p. 92.

⁶² Kee, Ireland: A History, p. 66-69.

⁶³ Coogan, The IRA: A History, p. 5

⁶⁴ Boyce, Nationalism in Ireland, p. 134-135.

that settled in America created a political force of Irish-Americans that has provided much of the impetus and finance for the Irish revolts that have taken place.⁶⁵

The creation of the Irish Republican Brotherhood (IRB) in the 1850s marked the beginning of small-scale organized political violence in the name of an Irish Republic. The IRB was a precursor of the IRA and Sinn Fein.⁶⁶ The constitutional and revolutionary movements began to coalesce under the leadership of Charles Stewart Parnell, who made repealing the Union Act and instigating Home Rule for Ireland the basis of his political platform. He started an organization called the "Land League," where the constitutional, revolutionary and Catholic national movements mingled.⁶⁷

These were times of constant agitation in Ireland caused by revolutionary groups, making the country almost ungovernable. At the same time Parnell was using political savvy to gain pledges from 85 members of the House of Commons giving him the balance of power in Parliament. This prompted British Prime Minister Gladstone to introduce a Home Rule Bill for Ireland in 1886.⁶⁸ The measure was defeated and Parnell was brought down by a sex scandal.⁶⁹ Despite Parnell's troubles, Home Rule continued to be the major issue in Irish politics until World War I. A side effect of the introduction of the Home Rule Bill was the creation of Protestant Unionist, or Loyalist,

⁶⁵ Coogan, The IRA: A History, p. 6.

⁶⁶ Ibid. p. 4.

⁶⁷ Kee, Ireland: A History, p. 120-122.

⁶⁸ O'Brien, A Concise History of Ireland p. 114-115.

⁶⁹ Kee, Ireland: A History, p.135.

organizations that feared being dominated by Catholics in the south should home rule pass.⁷⁰ The most powerful organization that sprung up in opposition to the home rule bill was the Orange Order. It was founded by Protestant elites to maintain the laws and peace of the country and the Protestant constitution.⁷¹ The Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF), a private Protestant army, was also formed to counter home rule in a violent way.⁷² The Orange Order gained power in the Ulster provisional government and was able to wield some control over the British Prime minister because he was dependant on their support against his opposition party in the English Parliament. The Orange Order used this power to cause the Home Rule movement to grind to a halt.⁷³

When World War I began, the IRB and UVF encouraged their members to join the British army to support the war effort. The Protestants and Catholics fought side-by-side in Irish Brigades as comrades and friends.⁷⁴ The opportunity that the war provided split the IRB, which had always suffered from conflicting motives and questions of leadership.⁷⁵ Some of the factions believed in Socialism as the basis for a new Ireland, while others wanted a united Ireland based on religion. The nationalist movement, as a

⁷⁰ Ibid. p.137.

⁷¹ Coogan, The IRA: A History, p. 6

⁷² R. S. P. Elliot and John Hickie, Ulster: A Case Study in Conflict Theory, (New York, St Martin's Press, 1971) p. 21.

⁷³ Kee, Ireland: A History, p.138-9.

⁷⁴ Boyce, Nationalism in Ireland, p. 284-5.

⁷⁵ J. Bowlyer Bell, The Irish Troubles: A Generation of Violence, 1967-1992, (New York, St. Martin's Press, 1993) p. 29.

whole split along lines of trying to find a political solution versus using force to liberate Ireland. Questions of leadership ranged from which national leader should speak for the movement, to disagreements between local military leaders.⁷⁶

One group that did not join the war effort, the Ulster Volunteers, wanted to take advantage of the situation by staging a revolt while the British were busy with Germany.⁷⁷ Not all of the Volunteers agreed with this and orders for a full mobilization were countermanded just prior to the planned uprising. When the Volunteers did march out on 24 April 1916 to meet the might of the British empire they were only 1200 strong.⁷⁸ This became known as the Easter Rebellion of 1916. The British crushed the rebellion with such ferocity and viciousness that the general public, which had not supported the rebellion, became sympathetic to the IRB's cause.⁷⁹ The British executed the 14 leaders of the rebellion trying to end the movement, but in the 1918 Parliamentary elections the Sinn Fein, then the revolutionary party, won most of the Irish seats in the English Parliament. Instead of taking those seats it set up an Irish Parliament and issued a Declaration of Independence.⁸⁰

⁷⁶ Bell, The Secret Army, p. 7-8.

⁷⁷ O'Brien, A Concise History of Ireland p. 135-36.

⁷⁸ Coogan, The IRA: A History, p. 17

⁷⁹ White, Provisional Irish Republicans. p.19-21.

⁸⁰ Nicholas Mansergh, The Irish Question: 1840-1921, (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1965) p.204-6.

After World War I, a guerrilla war for Irish independence began. This conflict is often referred to as the "Tan War," after the British troops, the Black and Tans, who were hastily assembled and sent to Ireland. To fight this war, the Volunteers and the IRB became the first Irish Republican Army.⁸¹ They employed roving bands of gunmen who used sniper attacks and bombings to fight the Black and Tans. The British forces resorted to terrorizing the civilian population as a way to fight back. The terror tactics continued on both sides until in the early 1920's when a truce was signed and Ireland was partitioned.⁸² Home-rule parliaments were established in both Belfast and Dublin. The treaty that came out of the truce also established the south as a declared free state within the British Commonwealth. This caused a split within the Nationalist parties in the south, those pro-treaty and those against who did not think the treaty went far enough in freeing the Irish people. The two sides clashed which led to a savage civil war in the Irish Free State. This costly war was ostensibly over the niceties of Republican doctrine.⁸³ Many of these divisions caused by the civil war still influence Irish politics. The conflict reveals a tradition of conflict within the Irish factions that is still a characteristic of these groups.⁸⁴ In 1923 the Pro-Treaty parties won the civil war

⁸¹ Coogan, The IRA: A History, p. 18.

⁸² O'Neil, Three Perennial Themes of Anti-Colonialism: The Irish Case, p. 35.

⁸³ V. G. Kiernan, "The Emergence of a Nation," Nationalism and Popular Protest in Ireland, (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987) p. 48.

⁸⁴ O'Neil, Three Perennial Themes of Anti-Colonialism: The Irish Case, p. 35.

and in 1937 a new constitution was adopted.⁸⁵ In 1949 the Republic of Ireland was established ending the British influence in Southern Ireland. In the same year the Ireland Act confirmed the status of Northern Ireland as part of the United Kingdom until British Parliament decided otherwise.⁸⁶

The IRA began a campaign against the north in 1956. It lasted until 1962 and was mostly a failure. It was the rifts that formed when looking to place the blame for this failure that led to the split in the IRA.⁸⁷ In 1969 IRA split along lines of ideological lines. The provisional IRA and Provisional Sinn Fein⁸⁸ broke away from the Marxist based original organizations. This is also when the most recent period known as the known as “The Troubles” in Northern Ireland began. The provisional IRA drew in those who had left the old IRA and Catholic vigilante groups and set forth to expel the British from Northern Ireland.⁸⁹ The IRA has grown to be one of the most highly disciplined and best armed terrorist groups in the world.

In the 25 years that constitute “The Troubles” in Northern Ireland, many watershed events have occurred. For instance after British troops fired on a peaceful

⁸⁵ O’Brien, A Concise History of Ireland, p. 152-154.

⁸⁶ Kevin Boyle and Tom Hadden, Northern Ireland: The Choice, (New York, Penguin Books, 1994) p. x-xi.

⁸⁷ Bell, The Secret Army, p. 302-307.

⁸⁸ The original IRA and Sinn Fein is only referred to in this thesis during the period between World War I and the 1969 split. All other references to IRA and Sinn Fein are actually the Provisional Irish Republican Army and the Provisional Sinn Fein. The original groups have almost totally disappeared.

⁸⁹ Matt Dillon, The Dirty War, (London, Arrow Books Limited, 1990) XXIII-XXXV.

demonstration and killed 13 unarmed civilians on 30 January 1972, what is known as Bloody Sunday,⁹⁰ the Northern Ireland Parliament was suspended. The British Government established "Direct Rule" over Northern Ireland, which gave it control over security matters and all matters to do with the courts.⁹¹ In 1973 a new Northern Ireland Assembly was elected and power sharing was attempted. This failed in part due to a strike by the Ulster Workers Council in 1975 which then led to the re-institution of direct rule.⁹² In 1982 a new Northern Ireland Assembly was elected. To protest the Assembly as an inadequate solution the Sinn Fein and SDLP refused to take the seats they had won.⁹³ A steady state of perceived futility and stalemate continued until 1985, when a new hope was born for the future. The Anglo-Irish Agreement of 1985 is the milestone that led to the present talks and the present IRA cease-fire. On 31 July 1994 the IRA put an end to its almost continuous 25 year reign of violence, in search of a negotiated peace. It remains to be seen if this is truly an end to the death and destruction in this conflict.

⁹⁰ J. Bowyer Bell, The Gun in Politics: An Analysis of the Irish Political Conflict, 1926-1986, (New Brunswick, Transaction Publishers, 1987) p. 155.

⁹¹ David Bleakley, Peace in Ireland: Two States, One People, (London, Mowbray, 1995) p. 110.

⁹² Bell, The Secret Army, p. 409-411.

⁹³ Coogan, The IRA: A History, p. 383.

C. NEGOTIATIONS AND CEASE-FIRES

There have been several previous attempts at a negotiated peace. Major progress occurred with the Anglo-Irish Agreement of 1985. To fully understand the impact of the United States involvement in the current prenegotiations a closer look at the previous attempts at negotiating a settlement to the Northern Ireland problem is needed. These earlier attempts are important because the United States was not as involved in these negotiations and they failed.

In 1972, a cease-fire, similar to the one of 1994, was declared by the IRA as a concession to the British government in exchange for talks.⁹⁴ Many of the same issues being considered during the present talks, such as permanence of a cease-fire and the Protestant veto, were discussed. Some of the same people that are involved in today's prenegotiations, including Gerry Adams, were involved then. This gives those who were involved an advantage of having been in a similar situation before. The 1972 cease-fire fell apart when a confrontation between British soldiers and Catholic civilians occurred. Despite this these first talks were a landmark event because the British Government did, for the first time interact with Sinn Fein and IRA leaders, who had been released from prison just for that purpose.⁹⁵

Discreet negotiations with Protestant clergymen took place in 1974 at Feakle in hopes of starting another dialogue with Britain. The meeting was broken up when the

⁹⁴Bell, The Secret Army, p. 415.

⁹⁵Ibid p. 388-391.

Special Branch⁹⁶ arrived and the IRA negotiators scattered, but a beginning was made. An extended Christmas cease-fire was declared and talks ensued.⁹⁷ Random violence continued, but for the most part the IRA kept its word and stopped its bombing campaign. The major demands by the IRA were the withdrawal of British troops to barracks, an end to internment, and acknowledgment of the right of the Irish people to control their destiny.⁹⁸ The increased killings by the Unionist groups and lack of progress in the talks lead to the resumption of the IRA terrorist offensive.

In 1975 another “cease-fire in exchange for negotiations” deal between the IRA and the British Government was made. Violence continued to be perpetrated by the Unionists in attempts to stop the end the IRA cease-fire. A new Republican group the Irish National Liberation Army (INLA) also continued terrorists operations.⁹⁹ Random acts of terrorism began to escalate as the talks stalled and then the infamous Miami Show Band incident occurred. On 1 August 1975 a group of UVF men stopped a van near the border that was carrying members of the Miami Show Band back from a dance. The five band members were lined up and machine gunned, killing three and wounding the other two. In an effort to destroy the van two UVF men were killed in a

⁹⁶ The Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) is the mostly Protestant police force in Northern Ireland. The Special Branch is the intelligence branch of RUC that deals with terrorists.

⁹⁷ Coogan, The IRA: A History, 368.

⁹⁸ Bell, The Secret Army, p. 415.

⁹⁹ Coogan, The IRA: A History, 409.

premature explosion.¹⁰⁰ Within two months of this event the IRA renewed its English bombing campaign in earnest and 1976 became one of the bloodiest years of "The Troubles." Before its next big peace initiative Northern Ireland had to endure a decade of "gestation."¹⁰¹

The Anglo-Irish Agreement signed on 15 November 1985 is the foundation on which the recent prenegotiations are based.¹⁰² British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and Irish Taoiseach Charles Haughey signed the agreement, which had four basic elements to it which are part of the context of the present prenegotiations. The first was the reiteration of the principle that any change in Northern Ireland's status would only come about with the consent of the majority of the people of Northern Ireland. The second was the creation of an intergovernmental ministerial conference, jointly chaired by British and Irish ministers. It was set with the task of seeking agreement on measures that would recognize and accommodate the interests of the two communities in Northern Ireland. The third was an agreement on a policy of devolving power to a Northern Ireland administration, provided it secured the cooperation of representatives of both communities. The fourth was an agreement that cross-border cooperation on security, economic and social matters should be continued and be enhanced.¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ Bell, The Secret Army, p. 422.

¹⁰¹ David Bleakley, Peace in Ireland: Two States, One People, p. 131.

¹⁰² The formal text of the Anglo-Irish Agreement is printed in Appendix C.

¹⁰³ Bell, the Irish Troubles, p. 704-706.

All of the progress made since 1985 has been based on the Anglo-Irish Agreement. The current cease-fire has been the first that has been joined by all parties. Of all of the negotiations and cease-fires, this one has had the least opposition and the best chance of creating, if not a unified Ireland, at least a lasting peace.

IV. PRENEGOTIATIONS

This chapter examines the prenegotiations that began with the British Government acknowledgment on 27 November 1993 that it had engaged in secret contacts with the IRA during the previous ten months.¹⁰⁴ Currently the prenegotiations have agreed that formal all-party negotiations are to begin in February 1996.¹⁰⁵ The road traveled to get from November 1993 to December 1995 has been a much publicized journey of miscues, misunderstandings, demands, concessions, arm twisting, cajoling and other exercises that negotiators engage in when dealing with a difficult issue. The following is a chronological description of the public debate and actions that occurred in the 24 months of prenegotiations that followed the British Government's discloser.

A. TALKS ABOUT TALKS

The first stage of the negotiations started when the British Government and the Government of the Republic of Ireland both received signals, through separate sources, that the IRA was willing to end the violence and wanted to call a truce. For ten months messages were sent back and forth among these three parties, while trying to

¹⁰⁴ "Britain Confirms Contacts With the Outlawed IRA," *Facts On File*, 2 December 1993, vol.53 no.2766 p.889.

¹⁰⁵ "Look Someone's Blinked," *The Economist*, 2 December 1995, p. 57.

maintain secrecy.¹⁰⁶ These messages were released by the British Government to try to diffuse criticism over its negotiating with terrorists. Contact with the IRA and Sinn Fein broke a British Government pledge not to negotiate with terrorists.¹⁰⁷ There are many reasons for the secrecy and breaking that pledge was one of them. The announcement was a risk, but the disclosure brought the debate into the public. The British Government hoped to waylay any fears it was giving away Northern Ireland. Also by making the messages public it showed that an end to violence was a prerequisite for the political representatives of the IRA, Sinn Fein, to be allowed at the negotiating table.¹⁰⁸ The expected backlash within the two combative groups in Northern Ireland, the Protestant majority and the Catholic minority, were also a consideration in maintaining the secrecy. Another problem for Prime Minister Major was the reaction of the Members of Parliament from Ulster, whom Major needed to maintain his government. These all proved to be valid concerns when the news of the proceedings came to light in November of 1993.¹⁰⁹

The secrecy created problems that would materialize later. For example, questions about the full disclosure of all agreements reached and about the integrity of

¹⁰⁶ "Patriot Games," *The Economist*, 4 December 1993, p. 59-60.

¹⁰⁷ John Darnton, "Britain Releases Notes Exploring Peace With IRA," *New York Times*, 30 November 1993, p. A1.

¹⁰⁸ "Patriot Games," p. 59.

¹⁰⁹ "Talking to the IRA," *The Economist*, 4 December 1993, p. 17-18. John Darnton, "Britain Releases Notes Exploring Peace With IRA," *New York Times*, 30 November 1993, p. A1. "Britain Confirms Contacts With the Outlawed IRA," *Facts On File*, 2 December 1993, vol.53 no..2766 p.889.

the negotiators were rendered.¹¹⁰ According to Fred Ikle', "Secrecy itself can throw negotiators under suspicion. If the public or nonparticipating governments sense an undercover bargain, a subsequent event, unconnected with the agreement actually reached in secrecy, may impair the bargaining reputation."¹¹¹ The suspicion among the parties involved negotiations existed before the announcement of the British-IRA contact. The secrecy surrounding it only added to the distrust and made the rest of the prenegotiation process more difficult. A Downing Street aide believed that, "Had the talks remained secret much more progress could have been made,"¹¹² but the prenegotiation process was made public and the rest of the prenegotiations were influenced by public opinion.

Despite optimism from some, especially in the United States, more problems arose before any agreement was reached. While the question of the IRA ceasing violence was being debated, critics started pointing to the Loyalist and Republic fringe elements that had become more violent in recent years they wondered what their part

¹¹⁰ Sarah Womack, Major Orders Paisley Out in dispute Over Integrity," *Press Association* (London), 6 September 1994. FBIS. Ian Paisley, "Tick Off All These Pledges To Sinn Fein," *Belfast Telegraph*, 1 May 1995, p. 8.

¹¹¹ Fred C. Ikle', How Nations Negotiate, Millwood, Harper & Row Publishers, 1964, p. 86-87.

¹¹² "No Secrets Among Enemies: Northern Ireland," *Time*, 13 Dec 1993, p. 55.

in the peace process would be.¹¹³ Even the more main-stream Protestant leaders were accusing the British Government of a sell-out of Loyalists in Ulster.¹¹⁴

B. DOWNING STREET DECLARATION

Much of the criticism of the British government was dissipated when on 15 December 1993 the Downing Street Declaration was issued by Prime Minister Major and Taoiseach, Irish Prime Minister, Reynolds. The declaration was an agreement to hold negotiations and to develop a framework for peace.¹¹⁵ Also included in the declaration was a statement that the status of Northern Ireland would not change without a referendum passed by a majority in Ulster. The most innovative point in the declaration was that, if the IRA put a permanent end to their terrorist campaign, then Sinn Fein could participate in the negotiations on the future of Ireland. Downing Street claimed that no concessions would be made until the IRA stopped their campaign of violence and no talks would occur until cease-fire lasted for at least a three-month period.¹¹⁶

This declaration fulfilled several functions of prenegotiations. The first set the participants and rules that would have to be followed to be involved in the formal

¹¹³ "The Irish Solution," *The New Republic*, 20 December 1993, p. 7.

¹¹⁴ O'Sullivan, "Give Peace a Chance" *National Review*, p. 45.

¹¹⁵ Daniel Pedersen, "Why Peace is Not at Hand in Ulster," *Newsweek*, 27 December 1993, p. 33

¹¹⁶ John O'Sullivan, "Give Peace A Chance," *National Review*, 24 January 1994, p.44-45.

negotiations. Trying to garner domestic support with the release of the declaration was a gamble which paid off for both British Prime Minister John Major and Irish Taoiseach Albert Reynolds.¹¹⁷ Gaining public support is also a prenegotiation function that this act accomplished.

With the release of the Downing Street Declaration, the position of the United States Government was as President Clinton put it, "cheering from the sidelines."¹¹⁸ This is where the British Government and the Ulster Protestants wanted the United States to stay. American involvement would only have heightened Loyalists' paranoia. They feared Irish-American Catholics and their political influence. Soon they saw that their fears were not unfounded.¹¹⁹ For the British and Irish governments, the Downing Street Declaration marked the first turning point or "threshold of seriousness,"¹²⁰ and an entering into the first two stages of prenegotiations.¹²¹ This would not happen for the other parties involved until later in the prenegotiations.

The Downing Street Declaration gave the IRA and especially Sinn Fein legitimacy they had not had before. By mentioning them in an official declaration, a *de facto* recognition as political bodies rather than terrorist organizations was given to

¹¹⁷ "Talking to the IRA," p. 17.

¹¹⁸ Pedersen, "Why Peace Is Not at Hand in Ulster," p. 33.

¹¹⁹ Ibid. p. 33.

¹²⁰ William Zartman, "Negotiations: Theory and Reality," *Journal of International Affairs* v9 no. ,1975, p. 69.-77.

¹²¹ Saunders, "We Need a Larger Theory of Negotiation," *Negotiating Journal*, p. 246.

these groups. The Sinn Fein was now considered to be on the same level as "legitimate" governments and political parties.¹²² This happened while the IRA was still officially listed by the United States and other nations as a terrorist organization. This new legitimacy gained by the IRA and Sinn Fein would affect the prenegotiations later.

The responses to the declaration by other parties involved were as varied as the agenda's of the organizations that made them. The most important were those made by the main groups that were directly affected; the Republicans and the Unionists. The harshest response came from the most conservative and vocal of the Loyalists, Reverend Ian Paisley. He came out in full-blown opposition to the declaration as a shameful sellout, but other Unionist leaders, such as Jim Molyneaux, came out in support of the declaration.¹²³ The Unionists expected this peace plan to fail as the others had and did not expect the IRA to be able to main a cease-fire.¹²⁴ To try to force the IRA to raise its level of violence and to show that the Republicans could not maintain a cease-fire, the Loyalists stepped up their campaign of terror and violence.¹²⁵

C. CLARIFICATION

The response of the IRA to the Downing Street Declaration was not one of acceptance or rejection, but they tried to tease out the declarations implications without

¹²² "Patriot Games," *The Economist*, p. 59.

¹²³ "Talking to The IRA," *The Economist*, p. 17.

¹²⁴ O'Sullivan, "Give Peace A Chance," *National Review*, p. 46

¹²⁵ Pedersen, "Why Peace Is Not at Hand in Ulster," *Newsweek*, p. 33.

committing to anything. To do this, Sinn Fein requested a clarification of the declaration.¹²⁶ By requesting clarification of the document Sinn Fein was trying to understand the definition of the problem, and doing this would complete the first stage of prenegotiations. The British and Irish Governments had already passed this phase with the preparation of the Downing Street Declaration. They were both in the second phase which was represented by their willingness and commitment to attempt a negotiated settlement. The IRA being a decentralized and often splintered organization¹²⁷, as a good terrorist organization needs to be,¹²⁸ could be expected to take a long time on agreeing on any definitions set forth. The demand for a public clarification served two other purposes. The first was that the IRA wanted an actual clarification and the second was to buy time while not seeming to be stalling. This use of the clarification question to buy time while putting the blame for the delays on others demonstrated solid negotiation tactics employed by Gerry Adams, the head of Sinn Fein. Examining the negotiating style of the other parties involved is another function of prenegotiation.

Any clarification by the British Government was originally seen by John Major as a concession. He refused to give in because he had said no concessions would be made. At this early point in the prenegotiations the British could not be seen as

¹²⁶ "Gerry Adams Views Crisis in Peace Process," *Der Standard*, in German 29 April 1994 p. 1. (FBIS).

¹²⁷ Coogan, The IRA: A History, p. 144.

¹²⁸ Dillon, The Dirty War, p. 27.

appeasing terrorists.¹²⁹ Gerry Adams pushed the Sinn Fein's bargaining position by threatening to reject the Downing Street Declaration and develop his own peace initiative.¹³⁰ John Major continued to refuse any form of clarification despite growing pressure to push the peace process forward.¹³¹ The Sinn Fein continued its request for clarification of the Downing Street Declaration. By the beginning of Spring the constant media assaults started to wear on the British government. To increase this pressure, Gerry Adams used the legitimacy that the declaration had a part in giving him to increase U.S. involvement in the prenegotiations.

D. THE UNITED STATES GETS INVOLVED

On 30 January 1994 the Clinton Administration, under pressure from 40 members of Congress granted Gerry Adams a visa to visit to United States. This was done against the wishes of the British government and the U.S. State Department.¹³² The visa was given, in part, because of the legitimacy given Sinn Fein by the declaration and John Major's willingness to deal with anyone who renounced

¹²⁹ James F. Clarity, "Both Sides Discuss Path Towards Talks," *New York Times*, 1 February 1994, p. A7.

¹³⁰ "Adams Threatens To Throw Out Major Peace Plan," *The Times* (London), 29 Mar 1994, p.10, FBIS.

¹³¹ "Coming to Terms," *The New Yorker*, 13 February 1994, p. 6.

¹³² Steven Greenhouse, "U.S. to Give I.R.A. Political Chief Visa to Attend Talks in New York," *New York Times*, 30 Jan 1994, p. A1.

violence.¹³³ The fear of the Unionists in Ulster that United States Government would become involved was now realized. This was due to pressure from members of the U.S. Congress. Many of Congressmen putting pressure on President Clinton had large populations of Irish-Americans in their districts. Because of the undefined relationship between the IRA and the Sinn Fein, Gerry Adams was able to state his desire to see an end to the terrorist campaign without the IRA having to stop its acts of violence. This was seen as a fulfillment of Major's statement about who he would deal with. Just before Adams received his visa he said on television that he, "was absolutely convinced that we will have a negotiated settlement, and we will have an Ireland free of violence and conflict."¹³⁴ He went as far as to say, "I want to bring to an end to the Irish Republican Army, to be part of taking the gun out of Irish Politics."¹³⁵ President Clinton was able to use statements like these as well as Sinn Fein's undefined relationship with the IRA and there new found legitimacy to have the State Department give Adams the visa.

Gerry Adams used his legitimacy as an international statesmen, the support shown during his American trip, and the media to try to obtain the concession on clarification from the British. Sinn Fein submitted a short list of questions for clarification of Downing Street Declaration to Major, and, through Reynolds, to the

¹³³ Ibid p. A1.

¹³⁴ James F. Clarity, "Both Sides Discuss Path Towards Talks," *New York Times*, 1 February 1994, p. A7.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

United States Government.¹³⁶ This submission to the United States was done to involve the United States Government and the pro-Irish American press involved in the prenegotiations. Reynolds added pressure on the British Government and defined his position on the clarification by saying that no renegotiation of the declaration was going to happen, but if issues of genuine clarification were required the British government would have to deal with it.¹³⁷

At the same time Adams was using political pressure to try to get concessions from the British Government, the IRA declared a three day cease-fire from 5 April through 8 April 1994.¹³⁸ This cease-fire can be seen as a test of reciprocity, one of the other functions of prenegotiations, as well as a good public relations move. Instead of clarification the IRA received a "take it or reject it"¹³⁹ ultimatum from Major. This demonstrated a hard forceful negotiating position on the part of the British Government, but that would not last.

The media coverage was building on both sides of the Atlantic, and the blame for the stalled talks was starting to fall on John Major. To try to push the peace process forward and take advantage of the press, the United States put pressure on the British

¹³⁶ "Sinn Fein Submits Questions on Peace Declaration," *Press Association* (London), 13 May 1994.

¹³⁷ "Reynolds Urges UK to Respond," *Press Association* (London), 16 May 1994, FBIS.

¹³⁸ "IRA Announces Three-Day Cease-fire," *Press Association* (London), 30 March 1994, FBIS.

¹³⁹ "Major Restates Refusal of Dialogue With Sinn Fein," *The Daily Telegraph*, (London), 8 April 1994, p. 1-2.

government.¹⁴⁰ Once the Sinn Fein questionnaire became public it would have been hard to justify holding up the peace process because of an unwillingness to answer some questions. To avoid taking the blame for holding up the prenegotiations the British government issued a response to Sinn Fein's questions.¹⁴¹ Through and issuance of a response to the questions on clarification, the British Government showed that it was susceptible to being persuaded by outside influences to make concessions. The twenty page clarification outraged the Unionists to the point of Ian Paisley accusing the British Government of "lying through its teeth" and being in "cahoots with murderers."¹⁴²

The main point of the clarification that became a sticking point was in the wording the following text from the response to Sinn Fein.

To join the political dialog with the two governments, parties were not required to accept the Joint (Downing Street) Declaration. They were required only to declare and demonstrate a permanent end to violence, and to abide by the democratic process.¹⁴³

The first part of that statement is saying that the declaration is defining the problem and providing a framework for the negotiations that follow. This is one of the

¹⁴⁰ Chris Parkin and Sian Clare, "Reynolds Briefs U.S. Leaders," *Press Association* (London), 14 May 1994, FBIS

¹⁴¹ "Text ' of Government Response to Sinn Fein," *Press Association* (London), 19 May 1994.

¹⁴² "Reynolds Welcomes Response," *Press Association* (London), 19 May 1994, FBIS.

¹⁴³ "Text ' of Government Response to Sinn Fein," *Press Association* (London),

basic functions of prenegotiations.¹⁴⁴ The second part of the statement has the words that became the next point of debate. Those words are "declare," "demonstrate," and, most importantly, "permanent."

The Unionists added the British Government's response to Sinn Fein to their already long list of grievances. Accusations of a sellout and secret deals with the IRA by the British became the Loyalist rhetoric.¹⁴⁵ The Clinton Administration also received condemnation for allowing Gerry Adams into the United States. To the Unionists, this indicated that the United States Government was supporting the Sinn Fein and was getting in line with everyone else against them.¹⁴⁶ The clarification issue only reinforced their seeming isolation. In the eyes of Loyalists, the Republic of Ireland helped force the British government to give in to the IRA with the backing of the United States, which has always been pro-Irish.¹⁴⁷

All of the participating parties continued attempting to gain the high-ground in eyes of the public and media. No group wanted to be left out of the peace process and each wanted to be in the best position once the formal negotiations began. All those involved started to come to the realization that this attempt to solve the Northern Irish

¹⁴⁴ Stein, "Getting to the Table: The Triggers, Stages, Functions, and Consequences of Prenegotiation," in Getting To The Table p. 242.

¹⁴⁵ "Reynolds Welcomes Response," *Press Association* (London)

¹⁴⁶ Conner Cruise O'Brien, "An IRA Wolf Adjusts His Disguise," *The Independent* (London) 27 May 1994, p. 18.

¹⁴⁷ "Tinsel Patriots," *The Times* (London), 26 August 1994, p. 17.

problem was different because although the violence continued in Ulster,¹⁴⁸ so too did the peace process.

A difference in the basic negotiating styles of the IRA and the writers of the Downing Street Declaration became evident in statements made to the media. The British and Irish Governments saw the declaration as a frame that held a balanced set of principles that could be agreed upon.¹⁴⁹ Their idea was to start with principles, primarily the end to violence, then get the parties together for negotiations on the details. Sinn Fein regards negotiations differently. It believes that the small moves are the motor for change.¹⁵⁰ Martin McGuinness, the Vice President off Sinn Fein, said, "We believe that the peace process, necessarily by the nature of the thing, will be a series of small steps, and we believe that is far more important than grand unilateral gestures."¹⁵¹ Despite this statement, it was up to the IRA and Sinn Fein, after their questions had been answered, to keep the peace process rolling with a grand unilateral gesture.

In the month of August 1994, there were several issues that led to a gesture being made by the IRA. The first is that the IRA rejected the Downing Street

¹⁴⁸ "Reynolds Interviewed on Peace Talks" London ITV Television Network, 26 May 1994, FBIS. Martin Alioth, "Every Single Casualty Is Regrettable," *Der Standard* (Germany), 29 April 1994 p. 2.

¹⁴⁹ "Text of Government Response to Sinn Fein," *Press Association* (London), 19 May 1994, FBIS.

¹⁵⁰ "Government Rejects Call for Talks," *Press Association* (London), 6 Apr 1994, FBIS.

¹⁵¹ "Peace Process: Series of Small Steps," Dublin RTE Radio One Network, 20 May 1994, FBIS.

Declaration after the clarification.¹⁵² In doing so the IRA and Sinn Fein brought the same media pressure down on themselves that had been used on the British. The media is a tool that Adams used well. Losing media support would have been a blow to the Sinn Fein agenda and his negotiating tactics. To add to the pressure on the IRA, both Albert Reynolds and John Major pointed out that an acceptance of the declaration was not needed to participate in negotiations, as was clearly stated in British response to the question on clarification.¹⁵³ The only requirement was the IRA demonstrating a permanent halt to the violence and that would get Sinn Fein to the bargaining table where the declaration could be discussed. Gerry Adams, seeing what concessions he was already able to get, wanted a cease-fire to put pressure on London and Dublin for more concessions.¹⁵⁴

The IRA, in a last ditch effort to put the onus of peace back on the British, made a list of four concessions that had to be reached before a cease-fire was called, these demands were seen by most as too demanding. These demands were for British troop withdrawal, admission for the Sinn Fein representatives to talks with Downing Street, the release of prisoners, and the assurance that Britain would withdraw from Northern

¹⁵²George Jones and Richard Savill, "Major Gives Sinn Fein Two-Week Deadline," *The Daily Telegraph*, (London) 27 May 1994, p. 1.

¹⁵³"Reynolds Interviewed on Peace Talks" London ITV Television Network. FBIS.

¹⁵⁴ "London Ready To Give Up 'Authority' Over Ulster," *The Daily Telegraph* (London), 27 August 1994, p. 1-2.

Ireland and persuade the Unionists to accept that move.¹⁵⁵ The submission of the list was caused by a split in the factions within the IRA, with these demands coming from a faction which did not want a cease-fire. There were predictions of a possible "Bosnia-style civil war between Catholics and Protestants if the troops were removed,"¹⁵⁶ making the demand for troop withdrawal unreasonable and premature. These demands were seen by the other parties involved in the prenegotiations as issues that the formal negotiations were going to deal with. Despite the rumors of dissension in the IRA and request for concessions, the turning point for the IRA was reached when the complete cessation of military operations was declared by the IRA on 31 August 1994 in the following statement.

Recognizing the potential of the current situation and in order to enhance the democratic process and to underline our definitive commitment to its success, the leadership of the IRA have decided that as of midnight Wednesday, August 31st, there will be a complete cessation of military operations.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁵ "IRA Hardliners Divided Over Proposed Cease-Fire," *The Sunday Times*, (London), 28 August 1994, p. 20.

¹⁵⁶ Connor Cruise O'Brien, "Psychology Favors IRA on Northern Ireland Issues," *The Independent*, (London), 19 Aug 1994, p.18.

¹⁵⁷ "At Last?" *The Economist*, vol.332, no.7879, September 3rd-9th 1994, p. 55-56.

E. END OF VIOLENCE

The reactions to the statement were mostly positive, with the Republic of Ireland's and United States's Governments being very encouraged.¹⁵⁸ The Unionist responded as could be expected, with cries of a secret sell-out by the British and by being leery of IRA intentions.¹⁵⁹ The Loyalists did not believe that the IRA would give up violence without some sort of promise of a united Ireland.¹⁶⁰ Even with the claims that there were no deals cut with the British Government, the Irish Government, and Sinn Fein, the track record of John Major and secret negotiations did not help convince the Unionists.¹⁶¹

Often an event unconnected with a negotiation can have a major effect on the proceedings.¹⁶² This happened in the British-IRA prenegotiations right after the cease-fire was announced, when a transfer of IRA and Irish National Liberation Army (INLA) prisoners from England to Ulster occurred. This action just re-enforced the idea of a

¹⁵⁸ Deric Henderson , Ian Graham, and Chris Parkin, "Ireland's Reynolds To establish Peace Forum," *Press Association* (London), 31 August 1994. FBIS
John Darton, "IRA Said to be Close to Truce to End Violent Ulster Campaign," *New York Times*, 31 August 1994, p. A1.

¹⁵⁹ Ian Graham, "Loyalists React," *Press Association*, (London), 31 August 1994, FBIS.

¹⁶⁰ Nicholas Watt, "Loyalists Divided Over Whether To Lay Down Arms," *The Times* (London), 3 September 1994, p. 2.

¹⁶¹ Nick Cohen, Protestants Appeal for Concessions to Nationalists," *Independent on Sunday* (London), 4 September 1994 p. 2.

¹⁶² Ikle', How Nations Negotiate, p. 86.

secret deal in the minds of the Unionists.¹⁶³ Because of their belief of a secret deal made by the British with Sinn Fein, the Unionist paramilitary groups stepped up their attacks in hopes of provoking the IRA to break its new cease-fire.¹⁶⁴ The British response to the Unionist's allegations was a constant denial of any secret pact and a reassurance that the fate of Ulster still resided in the majority of the population.¹⁶⁵ This fact was put forth by both the British Government and the Irish Government in the Downing Street Document, which they co-authored.¹⁶⁶ The British response to the IRA cease-fire was somewhat more curious.

It was John Major's turn to request clarification, this time on the cease-fire's permanence.¹⁶⁷ The IRA used the word "complete" instead of "permanent" in describing the end of their terrorist campaign. The phrase, "declare and demonstrate a permanent end to violence,"¹⁶⁸ could be seen as half fulfilled by the IRA's statement. The required

¹⁶³ "Major 'Livid' at Prisoner Transfer to Ulster," *Press Association*, (London), 1 Sept 1994, FBIS.

¹⁶⁴ "Troubles Ahead," *The Times* (London), 31 August 1994, p. 13. Chris Parkin, "UVF Plants Bomb On Train; Detonator Explodes," *Press Association* (London), 12 September 1994. FBIS.

¹⁶⁵ Richard Savill and George Jones, "Now Loyalist Gunman Set Out Demands," *The Daily Telegraph* (London), 9 September 1995, p. 1.

¹⁶⁶ Alison Little, "Spring, No Secret Deal Over IRA Cease-fire," *Press Association* (London), 9 September 1994, FBIS. Richard Savill and Philip Johnston, Right Steps Up the Pressure Over Ulster," *The Daily Telegraph*, (London), 5 September 1994, p. 1.

¹⁶⁷ Jeremy Paxman, "Interview with Sir Patrick Mayhew," London BBC Television Network, 31 August 1994. FBIS.

¹⁶⁸ "Text ' of Government Response to Sinn Fein," *Press Association* (London), 19 May 1994.

demonstration, according to the original document and statements, would be a three-month period of non-violence which could then be followed by formal negotiations.¹⁶⁹ While the inclusion of the word "permanent" seems like a good idea, it could be, and should have been seen as a trap for the IRA. The only bargaining chip the IRA possessed for 25 years is violence and renouncing it permanently surrenders a major bargaining chip. The word "permanent" implies that there would be no more violence and therefore no longer a need for weapons. This would logically lead to a request by the British government for the IRA to give up its weapons, an issue that was and still is the major sticking point as of 30 November 1995.¹⁷⁰ If the word "permanent" had been used, there would be no way for the IRA to justify not surrendering arms before formal negotiations began. In the face of an unrepentant active enemy, the UFF and UVF, this is not a realistic idea. Prime Minister Major did shift his attitude on the issue of disarmament, possibly because of the realization of the IRA's position.

The first concession the IRA received after the cease-fire was the lifting of the media ban on members of Sinn Fein, a totally useless ban that made the British government seem like an oppressor.¹⁷¹ This was a bargaining chip that Major would have liked to use to get a better result, but Gerry Adam's U.S. visit made the point

¹⁶⁹ Sian Clare, "London Insists on IRA Clarification of Cease-Fire," *Press Association* (London), 6 September 1994, FBIS. David Wastell and Paul Goodman, "Major Ready To Ease Terms for IRA Talks," *The Sunday Telegraph* (London), 4 September 1994, p. 1.

¹⁷⁰ The establishment of a decommissioning panel was agreed upon in December 1995 in hope of by-passing the problems surrounding the issue of IRA disarming.

¹⁷¹ Ian Graham and Chris Parkin, "Major Lifts Broadcasting Ban, Pledges Referendum," *Press Association*, (London), 16 Sept 1994, FBIS.

moot. Major tried to get this to work to his advantage by saying that lifting the ban would make it easier for the Sinn Fein to say the cease-fire was permanent.¹⁷²

The Unionists put forth demands that were ignored by the British Government. Instead of acknowledging these demands the British Government stepped up the pressure for a cease-fire on the part of the Loyalists.¹⁷³ Pressure for a Unionist cease-fire also came from the Irish Government, the SDLP, Sinn Fein, and the U.S. Government.¹⁷⁴ The possibility of a Unionist cease-fire became more likely as the hard-line and the moderate Unionists started to split on this issue.

In early September the British government started to back off the word "permanent" realizing that if the peace process failed because they argued over a word, they would be to blame. Now the British Government put the emphasis on the IRA's "words and deeds" and realization that the cease-fire was actually lasting.¹⁷⁵ Sir

¹⁷² Ibid.

¹⁷³ " 'Full Text' of Major's Ulster Statement," *Press Association* (London), 16 September 1994.

¹⁷⁴ Chris Parkin, "Prime Minister Urges Loyalist Cease-fire," *Press Association* (London), 9 September 1994, FBIS. Jon Snow, "Interview with John Hume," London ITV Television Network, 15 September 1994, FBIS. Brian Walden, "Interview with Gerry Adams on Constitutional Talks," London ITV Television Network, 3 October 1994. FBIS. John Darnton, "Security Force Eases Up a Bit In Belfast," *New York Times*, 8 September 1994, p. A8.

¹⁷⁵ Gavin Cordon, Chris Parkin, and Goeff Meade, "Hurd Sees 'Progress in Right Direction,'" *Press Association* (London), 11 September 1994, FBIS.

Patrick Mayhew said, "It doesn't matter what the words are specifically as long as the intention is made clear."¹⁷⁶

At the same time Sinn Fein played the "Clinton card" by announcing another Adams's visit to the United States.¹⁷⁷ Despite repeated British requests that Gerry Adams not meet with high ranking Government officials, he met with National Security Advisor Anthony Lake. He also received a phone call from Vice President Gore.¹⁷⁸ While that was happening in the United States, Albert Reynolds was putting pressure on John Major to endorse the cease-fire that had lasted six weeks. The support from the United States had an influence on what occurred next.

On 13 October 1994 the Loyalist paramilitary groups declared a "halt to hostilities."¹⁷⁹ This act left the British Army the only military force still conducting operations in Ireland. The new cease-fire also made it seem that the British government was only partly balking at moving the prenegotiations forward towards formal negotiations.¹⁸⁰ John Major was ready to deal with that postulate, because he had left

¹⁷⁶ "Mayhew on Sinn Fein Response To Peace Issues," London BBC Television Network, 16 September 1994, FBIS.

¹⁷⁷ Ian Graham, "Reactions to Reynolds Views on Irish Unification," *Press Association* (London), 18 September 1994, FBIS.

¹⁷⁸ Douglas Jehl, "Clinton Lifts Ban on Contacts With Sinn Fein," *New York Times*, 4 October 1994, p. A6.

¹⁷⁹ Conner Cruise O'Brien, "How Long Before the Bullet's Fly," *The Independent* (London), 14 October 1994, p. 19.

¹⁸⁰ Adams: Onus for Peace on British Government," Interview on London BBC Television Network, 13 October 1994, FBIS.

the British government a way out. By claiming the IRA had shown, through their actions, a renouncement of violence, John Major was able to announce that the talks could take place before the year was out without it looking like he was caving-in.¹⁸¹

The debates in the press then centered on the removal of British troops from Ulster and the surrendering of arms by the IRA and Loyalist paramilitary organizations.¹⁸² These are two issues that would require face-to-face negotiations to resolve. The stalled "Framework for Peace," to be drafted by the British and Irish governments, was also a topic of much debate.¹⁸³ This delay was seen by the IRA as just another stalling tactic being used by the British Government. Frustration with the delays lead to the announcement by the Sinn Fein that 1 December 1994 was a deadline for talks. Gerry Adams claimed that if the British did not set up the promised meeting for the end of the three-month cease-fire period, 1 September - 1 December, it showed that the British did not want peace.¹⁸⁴ This statement and ultimatum led to the announcement that the meetings between Sinn Fein and British Government would start on 7 December 1994.¹⁸⁵ These talks did take place, but were not all-party

¹⁸¹ "Government Ready for Talks With Sinn Fein," *Press Association*, (London), 21 Oct 1994, FBIS.

¹⁸² Teilo Colley, "Major, Reynolds Make 'Steady Progress' in Ulster Talks," *Press Association* (London), 24 October 1994, FBIS.

¹⁸³ Chris Parkin, "Reynolds Welcomes John Major Announcement," *Press Association*, (London), 21 Oct 1994, FBIS.

¹⁸⁴ "Sinn Fein Leader Sets Deadline for Peace," *L'Untia*, (Rome), 5 Nov 1994, FBIS.

¹⁸⁵ John Darnton, "Britain And IRA Group To Begin Talks on Ulster," *New York Times*, 2 December 1994, p. A6.

negotiations at a ministerial level, the British representatives at these meetings were Government civil servants.¹⁸⁶

The United States Government announced in November of 1994 that it was raising aide to Northern Ireland \$30 million a year for the next two fiscal years. At the same time the White House announced that it was thoroughly engaged in pushing the peace talks forward, and that it had worked quietly to get the warring sides the lay down their arms.¹⁸⁷ The positive response from the American media and claim of a foreign policy success lead the White House to get more involved as the British-IRA prenegotiations wore on.

In Ireland Reynolds's *Fianna Fail* party was facing a possible vote of confidence over a ministerial appointment. The Labor party was threatening to pull out of its coalition Government.¹⁸⁸ Despite Reynolds's claim that a collapse of his government would hurt the peace process in Northern Ireland, the government did collapse when - the Labor party withdrew its support from *Fianna Fail* and joined with *Fianna Gael* to form a new government. John Burton head of the *Fianna Gael*, the former opposition party in the Irish Parliament, became the new *Taoiseach*.

¹⁸⁶ Ian Graham, "IRA Denies Planting Enniskillen Bomb," *Press Association* (London), 19 December 1994, FBIS.

¹⁸⁷ "Steven Greenhouse, "Ireland and Britain Praise Clinton's Ulster Aide," *New York Times*, 3 November 1994, p. A9.

¹⁸⁸ James F. Clarity, "Irish Chief Says Politics Hurts Peace Effort," *New York Times*, 14 November 1994, p. A4.

F. DELAYS

The subsequent delays and disagreements over the level of meetings became the next stumbling block. John Major justified the delays in formal negotiations by linking the issue of disarmament to ministerial-level negotiations, because all the planning and talks had taken place at the civil servant level, upgrading the level of negotiations was a major goal for the Sinn Fein.¹⁸⁹ This upgrade would give Sinn Fein more legitimacy and be another victory for the IRA.

The Framework Document was released on 22 February 1995, by John Major and the new Taoiseach John Burton. The document had many points, but it focused on reinstating a Northern Ireland assembly and dropping of the Republic of Ireland's claim to Ulster.¹⁹⁰ The Framework Document was set forth as a starting point for the formal all-party negotiations. This document fulfilled several aspects of prenegotiation theory by setting boundaries and creating a agenda.¹⁹¹ This moved all of the participants in the prenegotiations into the third phase of prenegotiations, arranging the negotiation.¹⁹² The Framework Document did more than just set a framework which included more firm boundaries. It also set an agenda for the coming negotiations, which is one of the most

¹⁸⁹ Sian Clare, "Sinn Fein's McGuiness Starts Visits to Britain," *Press Association* (London), 26 January 1994, FBIS.

¹⁹⁰ Gerry Adams, "Acknowledging Failure of a Partition," *The Irish Times*, 23 February 1996, p. 4.

¹⁹¹ Stein, "Getting to the Table: The Triggers, Stages, Functions, and Consequences of Prenegotiation," in Getting To The Table p. 246.

¹⁹² Saunders, "We need a Larger Theory of Negotiation," *Negotiating Journal*, p. 252.

important things that needs to be accomplished to increase the chances of success of the negotiation. In order to test public support, the document was released to all of the people in Ulster. This was an attempt to bypass the political leaders and appeal directly to the masses.¹⁹³ A good tactic to use when dealing with leaders who have diametrically opposing views and are experts at using the media to manipulate opinion.¹⁹⁴

The issue of disarmament continued to delay the talks until March, when the British eased their terms and the United States became more deeply involved. Sir Patrick Mayhew suggested that the Sinn Fein could enter the talks if it showed "a willingness, in principle, to disarm progressively."¹⁹⁵ At the same time tensions grew between Washington and London over an upcoming Gerry Adams visit to the United States. Senator Edward M. Kennedy was urging the federal government to allow Adams to engage in fund raising during his trip.¹⁹⁶ This was an enormous step to be taken by the United States, in fact, seemingly to take a position on the side of Sinn Fein and the IRA in the prenegotiations. A possible meeting between Adams and President Clinton was also being protested by the British government and strains from the

¹⁹³ James F. Clarity, "Britain and Ireland Issue a Plan for Full Talks on Ulster," *New York Times*, 23 February 1996, p. A3.

¹⁹⁴ Mark Simpson, "Bruton: Framework Document Implications For Ulster," *Belfast Telegraph* (Belfast), 23 February 1995, p. 8.

¹⁹⁵ Steven Greenhouse, "British Official Seems to Ease Terms for I.R.A. Role in Talks," *New York Times*, 8 March 1995, p. A4.

¹⁹⁶ James Hardy, "Go-Ahead for Adams' U.S. Trip Said Public," *Press Association* (London), 9 March 1995, FBIS.

disagreement over Bosnia were also tugging at the strings of Anglo-American relations.¹⁹⁷

For suspected reasons of internal American politics Gerry Adams, former terrorist, was allowed to fund raise openly in the United States, and was invited to the White House for a St. Patrick's Day reception.¹⁹⁸ On a day when everyone is an honorary Irishman the domestic political gain was quite large for any actions the United States Government took that could be seen as helping the peace process in Northern Ireland. Both the fund raising and the White House visit were strongly opposed by the British Government. Prime Minister Major suggested that such a reception for Adams could lead to increased tensions in British-American relations.¹⁹⁹ Despite the fact that the handshake between President Clinton and Gerry Adams was not photographed, it did occur and so did the increasing tensions.

G. THE UNITED STATES'S GROWING ROLE

The rift that formed between the leaders of the United States and Britain was supposedly patched up, but only after Prime Minister Major refused phone calls from

¹⁹⁷ Douglas Jehl, "Clinton to Permit Fund-Raising In the U.S. by Top I.R.A. Figure," *New York Times*, 10 March 1995, p. A1.

¹⁹⁸ John Darnton, "Britain Maintains Demand On I.R.A.," *New York Times*, 20 March 1995 p. A6

¹⁹⁹ Pam Belluck, "Sinn Fein's Leader Raises Funds at Queens Reception," *New York Times*, 13 March 1995, p. A2.

President Clinton for two weeks.²⁰⁰ The relationship may have been better in print, but tensions over Northern Ireland added to the continuing disagreements over Bosnia and caused the U.S.-U.K. gap to grow. London again changed its stand about ministerial level meetings and the first one took place between Gerry Adams and Sir Patrick Mayhew. This meeting occurred not in Belfast or London, but in Washington.²⁰¹ This meeting on 24 May 1995, to discuss investment in Ireland, is representative of the leverage wielded and interloping committed by the United States. The U.S. Government was able to get the talks upgraded, even if it was about money rather than the political problems. The all-party formal negotiations were still being debated.

The prenegotiations bogged down on the issue of disarmament through the spring of 1995 with little, or no progress occurring.²⁰² Several other crises took precedence on the world stage and on the British home front. John Major almost lost his role as party leader and with it his role as Prime Minister. There were also outbreaks of violence in Northern Ireland that delayed talks, but by the end of July the prenegotiations seemed to be moving again.²⁰³ Meetings between the British and Irish governments led to proposals on three major issues, disarmament, full-fledged all-party

²⁰⁰ Steven Greenhouse, "Clinton and Major Patch Up Quarrel on Northern Ireland," *New York Times*, 5 April 1995, p. A3.

²⁰¹ "The future of Sinn Fein," *The Economist*, vol.335, no.7916, May 27th-June 3rd 1995, p. 49-50.

²⁰² "Government Stresses Sinn Fein Arms Decommissioning," *Press Association* (London), 24 Apr 1995, FBIS.

²⁰³ James F. Clarity, "Sinn Fein Leader Says He Met In Secret With British Official," *New York Times*, 24 July 1995, p. A4.

talks, and a prisoner release. One proposal for the follow-on negotiations had the talks occurring in two groups with the British and Irish Governments participating in both groups. One group would be the Sinn Fein, the mostly Catholic Social Democratic Labor Party, and the Alliance Party which has a 60-40 mix of Protestants and Catholics. The second group would include the Protestant Unionist parties. A plan for the prisoner issue was released after half time served, for some of the 600 IRA guerrillas and 400 Protestant paramilitaries in prison.²⁰⁴ The hardest issue to come up with a plan for was, and still is, the disarmament issue. The concept of having an International Disarmament Commission was put forward at these meetings. The questions of the timing of the commission, the actual turning in of weapons, and the start of the actual negotiations continued to delay the beginning of all-party negotiations.²⁰⁵

The press started to fan the fires as the one year mark of the cease-fire approached. President Clinton planned a trip to Europe in early December, and one of the goals of that trip was to have Clinton become the first United States President to visit Northern Ireland. President Clinton applied more pressure with statements about the delay in the prenegotiations. He said, "I am discouraged by the lack of progress. Anyone who was told a year ago that there would be a year-long cease-fire, with no

²⁰⁴ James F. Clarity, "New Plan Drawn to Promote Irish Peace Effort," *New York Times*, 25 July 1995, p. A4.

²⁰⁵ James F. Clarity, "Ulster Talks Move Closer, Officials Say," *New York Times*, 3 October 1995, p. A5.

sign of it ending, and that there would be no broad-scale political dialog, would have been shocked.”²⁰⁶

The prenegotiations reached a low within a week of the one-year anniversary of the cease-fire when more talks were canceled over the disarmament issue.²⁰⁷ Any turnover of IRA arms would be construed as a surrender by some of the factions within the IRA, and that could cause the IRA to splinter into different militant factions. For the British Government having the IRA fully armed would force negotiators to sit across from Sinn Fein representatives with “weapons under the table. The IRA still being fully armed would mean that the threat of renewed violence would give the Sinn Fein an unbeatable hand.”²⁰⁸ The White House applied pressure to both sides to compromise and to find language that could be used to save “face”.²⁰⁹ In late October a meeting between Anthony Lake and senior British officials took place and the language in the subsequent British Government statements softened. The next step in the peace effort would be the establishment of a disarmament panel and the start of talks between all parties.²¹⁰ Britain’s Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Patrick Mayhew, stated that his government would consider an alternative to the IRA disarming as a pre-

²⁰⁶ Conor O’Clery, “U.S. Support For The Peace Initiative Is As Strong As Ever,” *The Irish Times*, (On The Web), 31 August 1995, p.1.

²⁰⁷ John Darnton, ”Ulster Danger Point,” *New York Times*, 11 September 1995, p. A6.

²⁰⁸ Ibid. p. A6.

²⁰⁹ Clarity, “Ulster Talks Move Closer, Officials Say,” *New York Times*, p. A5.

²¹⁰ James Clarity, “ Britain Hints at an Apparently Major Shift in Policy over I.R.A. Disarmament Issue,” *New York Times*, 18 October 1995, p. A8.

condition to inclusion of Sinn Fein in talks.²¹¹ To try to find this alterative the longest meeting between a British minister and a member of Sinn Fein took place on 31 October 1995, with little progress being made on this key issue.²¹²

After hours of talks and pressure being applied by the Clinton Administration to have the impasse solved before the President's visit, a compromise was proposed.²¹³ The idea was to have a twin track approach where a disarmament commission would find a formula under which arms could be handed in. Once the formula was found, then the full-fledged talks could begin.²¹⁴ The British Government still did not like the plan because nothing would be given up before all-party negotiations started. The IRA and Sinn Fein were upset because the only guns the British wanted to take out of Irish politics were the IRA's.²¹⁵ Feeling pressure from all sides, an agreement was reached just hours before President Clinton arrived in London. The latest plan is to have the decommissioning panel headed by former Senator George J. Mitchell get together and make its non-binding recommendations by mid-January. The formal talks are to start in

²¹¹ "Fresh Hope of Breakthrough On North," *News of Ireland*, (Internet), 26 October 1995.

²¹² "Progress Cited in IRA Talks," *Associated Press*, (Internet), 31 Oct 1995.

²¹³ James Clarity, "Dublin's Leader Asks London To Compromise with the I.R.A.," *New York Times*, 13 November 1995, p. A6.

²¹⁴ "News in Ireland," *Reuter* (Internet/AOL), 13 November 1995.

²¹⁵ "News in Ireland," *Reuter* (Internet/AOL), 10 November 1995.

February with preparatory framework talks starting right away.²¹⁶ These preparatory talks will finish solidifying the framework for the actual negotiations.

If the prenegotiations are any indication, the formal negotiations on this complex issue are going to be long and arduous and they will afford this and future U.S. Administrations an opportunity to get involved.

²¹⁶ Richard W. Stevenson, "British and Irish Break Logjam On Talks Over Future of Ulster," *New York Times*, 29 November 1995, p. A1. Frank Millar and Rachel Borrill, "All party Talks in February," *The Irish Times*, (On The Web), 29 November 1995, p. 1.

V. CONCLUSION

The British Government, the Sinn Fein and the rest of the parties involved in the British-IRA prenegotiations are the closest they have ever been to sitting down and finding a negotiated peace in Northern Ireland. This thesis set out to examine the U.S. role in the process that brought the parties to this point. By focusing on the U.S. role and comparing it to the structure provided by prenegotiation theory, the Northern Ireland case can contribute to the field of study in prenegotiations and its application to other cases.²¹⁷

Prenegotiation theory offers a structured way to look at the process of getting to the negotiating table. How well this case fits the structure of prenegotiation theory is explored in Chapter IV. The part of prenegotiation theory that has the most effect on the outcome of the follow-on negotiations are the functional areas of prenegotiations. The more of the seven functions that are accomplished before the formal negotiations begin, the more likely a successful outcome of the negotiation.²¹⁸

In the British-IRA case, the functions of prenegotiations were accomplished over a period of two years. The function of setting the participants was laid out by the Downing Street Declaration but was not completed until the cease-fires by the IRA and Loyalist paramilitaries were accepted by the British as permanent. The function of

²¹⁷ George, "Case Studies and Theory Development," p. 62-63.

²¹⁸ Stein, "Getting to the Table," p. 256.

boundary setting for the prenegotiations was accomplished with the release of the Downing Street Declaration. It was then debated by Sinn Fein and the Unionist groups right up till the announcement of the formal talks beginning in February 1996.²¹⁹ One of the most important functions that contributes to successful negotiations is setting the framework or agenda for the follow-on negotiations. The framework was established with the release of the aptly named Framework Document,²²⁰ which was based largely on the 1985 Anglo-Irish Agreement. It was the acceptance of this agenda by Sinn Fein and the IRA that makes this attempt at negotiations different from previous ones.

The function assessing risks is often associated with the function of gaining public support. From the very beginning of this two year prenegotiation process these functions were linked. The British acknowledgment of the secret talks occurring is a good example of this linkage.²²¹ Gerry Adams had the least risk factor, because of the undefined relationship of Sinn Fein and the IRA, and was able to use the press to gain public support. The ability to use the media to gain public support is an example of a negotiating style. Assessing negotiating style is another function of prenegotiations, assessing. Adams was the best at assessing negotiating style and tactics and was able to estimate exactly how far he could push the British Government before he would lose public support. At the same time the British were able to see how Adams used the media and to plan for media reaction in their approach. At the same time the testing of

²¹⁹ Millar and Borill, "All Party Talks in February," p. 1.

²²⁰ Adams, "Acknowledging Failure of a Partition," p. 4.

²²¹ Darnton, "British Releases Notes Exploring Peace With IRA," p. A1.

style was occurring another function, testing reciprocity, was happening. This occurred, several times, but was most glaringly demonstrated when the IRA had its three-day cease-fire and its which ended hostilities. Both were done to gain concessions from the British Government. The major delays in the prenegotiation process occurred because the parties involved were involved in the last of the functions, they were testing alternatives. These last four functions of prenegotiations were tied together during the British-IRA prenegotiation process, and were undertaken by the main parties involved at one point or another.

The basic framework for the negotiations has been around for ten years in the form of the Anglo-Irish Agreement. The two sides of the conflict have diametrically opposed views, one side wants British rule and the other wants a united Ireland. Any middle ground is seen as a compromise and is unacceptable to some of the membership of the extreme groups, the IRA and the Loyalist paramilitaries. These facts need to be understood by any party getting involved in the negotiations in conflict. If the facts are not comprehended then any involvement by an outside party could have unplanned consequences.

The role of the United States in the prenegotiation process has shifted from "Clinton cheering from the sidelines"²²² to Clinton being thanked by Prime Minister Major for his support and his loan of Mr. Mitchell to chair the disarmament commission.²²³ The change in the two years between these quotes seems large, but it

²²² Pedersen, "Why Peace Is Not at Hand in Ulster," p. 33.

²²³ "Look Someone's Blinked," *The Economist*, 2 December 1995, p. 57.

is not. Some sources indicate that the Irish government engaged in a diplomatic campaign to get President Clinton's assistance in coercing Major to make the Downing Street Declaration. This included a massive diplomatic initiative which included Jean Kennedy Smith ,the American Ambassador to Ireland, having her brother, Senator Edward Kennedy, to put pressure on the President.²²⁴ When looking at the subsequent events it is not hard to believe that this backdoor persuasion occurred and that similar actions continued throughout the prenegotiation process. There are several other times that President Clinton intervened directly, or through indirect actions effected the prenegotiations. Gerry Adams was granted two visas to visit the United States partially at the urging of *Taoiseach* Renyolds. There was more direct involvement by the White House that helped the America's ability to apply pressure to both sides. The second Adams's visit, when fund raising for Sinn Fein was authorized, President Clinton extracted a promise from Adams to make a move on the arms issue that was holding up talks.²²⁵ President Clinton then used his relationship with Prime Minister Major, when he was taking the calls, to press the issue from the other end and try to close the gap.

Perhaps the greatest example of Clinton's influence on the prenegotiation process can be seen in the last breakthrough in these talks. The latest agreement occurred in a fury of action after months of stalemate just as President Clinton was getting on a plane to Europe. Intense White House pressure was applied to force the issue before his arrival. Both sides were afraid that he would come and go, with little to

²²⁴ Coogan, The IRA: A History, p.486.

²²⁵ Ibid. P. 485.

show for his trip except turning on the Christmas lights in Belfast.²²⁶ Another possibility for the rush to an agreement, that could have meant worse prospects for the Irish and British Governments, is that Clinton could have made progress during his visit and received the lion's share of the credit for the peace process. In the eyes of many Irish-American voters and many Irish, Clinton is given most of the credit for the recent success of the prenegotiations. One Irish farmer said, "Your President put our politicians on this side of the water to shame. He moved us a lot closer to peace."²²⁷ Even Prime Minister Major has given up his position that Northern Ireland is internal problem and now says that American intervention is welcome.²²⁸ Headlines from local Irish and English newspapers, "Clinton Flies In to Triumph," and "Clinton Shows True Leadership,"²²⁹ demonstrate just how big an impression his actions had.

There are important questions to be considered when looking at U.S. involvement as an outside party in the British-IRA prenegotiations. What side-effects has pushing along the prenegotiations had for the United States and President Clinton, and will they affect future involvement in these and other talks? One side-effect of U.S. involvement in the prenegotiation is the negative impact the United States interference has had on the Anglo-American relationship. For weeks after the granting of Gerry

²²⁶ "Look Someone's Blinked," *The Economist*, 2 December 1995, p. 57.

²²⁷ James F. Clarity, "Clinton Role for Ulster: Focusing on the Big Picture," *New York Times*, 5 December 1995, p. A6.

²²⁸ Ibid.

²²⁹ Maureen Dowd, "The Impression of Green," *New York Times*, 30 November 1995, p A23.

Adams a second visa and the famous handshake on St. Patrick's Day, Prime Minister Major would not even accept President Clinton's calls. This is a bad situation for two of the most closely aligned nations in the world. It is even worse when looked at from the point of view that the United States was backing the Republic of Ireland's interests over Britain's. The Irish are not part of the NATO and they stayed out of World War II. At the same time the United States is asking for Downing Street's support for its Bosnia policy. It is surprising given these events, that the patching up of the relationship between Major and Clinton did not take longer. The President should be wary of trying to tax any other relationship in the future as hard as he did this one.

The next side-effect of U.S. involvement appears to be a positive one for President Clinton. He has a foreign policy victory on his record approaching an election year. After a dismal start for his administration Clinton is beginning to get some positive results in his foreign policy decisions. If catastrophe is avoided in Northern Ireland the chance of more diplomatic interventions is highly likely. There are problems that come with success. One is that a successful solution to the Northern Ireland problem will cause more groups to want to get the United States involved in their negotiations and conflicts. Another is that with the recent success in the Middle East talks and the IRA-British talks the idea of failure no longer seems like an option. Both of these conflicts are and will continue to be very difficult problems yet the United States seems able to facilitate peace anywhere, anytime. This is a dangerous concept for the U.S. Government to be saddled with.

Now that the United States has pushed and pulled the parties involved with the peace process in Northern Ireland into negotiations it seems that U.S. presence is necessary to keep the process going. In this way the United States and President Clinton are taking responsibility for the success or failure of the peace negotiations. This is a dangerous thing when dealing with a very complex issue. For the most part all of the citizens of Northern Ireland are better off under British rule, at least economically. The Republic of Ireland really can not afford to take over Ulster's debt and unemployment rate. Great Britain would be better off financially if it was able to get ride of that same burden. It can not because of its promise to the Protestant population of Northern Ireland, that is in many ways more Irish than English, that only a majority vote could change their status. The framework that is being purposed has been around for ten years with little movement and even less agreement. The United States is putting itself in the middle of, and in some ways taking responsibility for, a problem that is not likely to be solved anytime soon. Even if Clinton is reelected he is likely to leave his successor with this tar baby.

This thesis has demonstrated that the United States can help facilitate the prenegotiation process by pushing conflicting parties together. There are certain conditions that need to exist before this idea can be added to the reformulation of prenegotiation theory. The United States must be able to apply leverage to both sides and this leverage should be equally applied. In the Northern Ireland case the unequal application of pressure tested the United States relationship with Britain, which is one of the strongest alliances. Very few other alliances could withstand the same amount of

pressure. The United states has a unique place in international politics and therefore a unique ability to keep parties trying to find peaceful solutions to their conflicts moving in the right direction.

The result of the long process of prenegotiations in the Northern Ireland conflict will be even a longer process of negotiations. That process may not find an easy solution to the conflict, but it will lead to a lasting period of peace. Everyone in Northern Ireland is tired of the violence and wants to find a way to live in peace, and long term negotiations should give all the parties involved the excuse they need to not return to the warpath. To end this and sum up the matter, a quote from a seasoned IRA campaigner on the cease-fire, "We were in the long stages of war. Now we're in the long stages of peace."²³⁰

²³⁰Brendan O'Brien, The Long War: The IRA and Sinn Fein 1985 to Today, Syracuse, Syracuse University Press, 1995, p. 324.

APPENDIX A. CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS

- 1014 Battle of Clotarf: Viking driven from Ireland.
- 1169 English mercenaries invade Ireland at request of King of Leinster.
- 1601 Battle of Kinsale: Irish Chiefs stripped of all power.
- 1607 Flight of the Earls and "Plantation" of Ireland by King James I.
- 1690 12 July, Battle of Boyne: William of Orange defeats James II.
- 1789 United Irishmen Rising, death of Wolfe Tone.
- 1800 Act of Union creates United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.
- 1803 Robert Emmet's Rising, trial and execution of Emmet.
- 1829 Catholic emancipation.
- 1845 Great Famine begins, continues through 1848.
- 1848 Young Ireland Rising.
- 1867 Fenian Rising
- 1886 Gladstone's first Home Rule Bill introduced.
- 1893 Gladstone's second Home Rule Bill.
- 1912 Carson mobilizes Ulster Volunteer Force to oppose new Home Rule Bill.
- 1913 The Great Strike.
- 1916 Easter rising in Dublin: Irish Republic declared.
- 1918 Last all-Ireland elections.
- 1919 Sinn Fein declares Irish Republic and armed struggle for Irish Independence begins.
- 1920 Government of Ireland Act Provides for the partition of Ireland into a six-county Northern Ireland and a 26 county Southern Ireland, each with its own parliament and government, and for a Council of Ireland, and to deal with matters on an all-Ireland basis
- 1921 Anglo-Irish Treaty: agreement on the creation of an Irish Free State as a self-governing dominion and of Northern Ireland as partially self-governing unit within the United Kingdom. Boundary Commission established to review North-South border.
- 1922 Civil war begins between pro-Treaty and anti-Treaty parties in Irish Free State.
- 1923 Pro-treaty parties win civil war.
- 1925 Report of Boundary Commission suppressed. New Anglo-Irish treaty confirms six-county area of Northern Ireland and abandons the Council of Ireland.
- 1937 New Irish Constitution adopted.
- 1948 Irish Free State becomes a Republic and leaves British Commonwealth.
- 1956 Abortive IRA campaign in Northern Ireland begins.
- 1962 IRA campaign abandoned.
- 1968 Civil rights campaign begins.
- 1969 British troops deploy in Derry and Belfast.
- 1971 Internment begins.
- 1972 Northern Ireland Parliament suspended and direct rule introduced.

- 1973 United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland join EEC. New Northern Ireland Constitution. Elections for Northern Ireland Assembly. Sunningdale Agreement.
- 1974 Power-sharing Northern Ireland Executive established. Ulster Worker Council strike leads to collapse of Executive, dissolution of Assembly and restoration of direct rule.
- 1975 Elections for Northern Ireland Convention. Internment phased out.
- 1976 Report of the Convention agreed by the unionist parties only. Peace People movement launched.
- 1979 First elections for European Parliament held concurrently in Northern Ireland and the Republic Of Ireland.
- 1981 Anglo-Irish Intergovernmental Council established at Thatcher-Haughey summit.
- 1982 Elections for Northern Ireland Assembly under Prior's "rolling devolution" plan. SDLP and Sinn Fein refuse take up their seats.
- 1983 New Ireland Forum established by main political parties in republic of Ireland in association with SDLP.
- 1984 New Ireland Forum Report.
- 1985 Anglo-Irish Agreement. Unionists parties withdraw all cooperation with British government.
- 1988 First round of talks between SDLP and Sinn Fein.
- 1989 Official review of Anglo-Irish Agreement confirms established arrangements and promises renewed efforts to seek agreement on devolution for Northern Ireland.
- 1991 Brooke three-strand formula for talks between main Northern Ireland parties and British and Irish governments agreed. Internal Strand 1 talks break down after 10 weeks.
- 1992 Three-strand talks resumed. Official Unionist delegation meets Irish delegation in Dublin under Strand 2. Talks end inconclusively in November. Initiative '92 establishes Opsahl Commission.
- 1993 Opsahl Commission hearings and report. Renewed Hume-Adams talks deliver peace proposals to Irish government in September. Joint British-Irish Downing Street Declaration in December starts present peace initiative.
- 1994 Gerry Adams gets visa to visit United States in January. IRA declares a permanent end to violence in August. In October the Loyalist paramilitaries halt hostilities.
- 1995 The joint Anglo-Irish Framework Document is released in February. Gerry Adams visits the white House on St Patrick's Day and shakes President Clinton's hand. Disarmament Commission formation announced hours before President Clinton arrives in Europe on 30 November.

APPENDIX B. PARTICIPANTS

REPUBLICANS

Provisional Irish Republican Army (IRA).
Provisional Sinn Fein: The so-called political wing of the IRA.
Irish National Liberation Army (INLA): splinter group that still holds some Marxist ideals and they tend to be more reckless and unpredictable.
Gerry Adams: President, SINN FEIN.
John Hume: leader, Social Democratic and Labor Party (SDLP).
Martin McGuinness: Vice President/Deputy leader, SINN FEIN.
Alliance Party: a small Nationalist party with both Catholic and Protestant members.

UNIONIST/LOYALISTS

Democratic Unionist Party: (DUP) The furthest right and most vocal of the Loyalist parties.
Rev Ian Paisley: leader, Democratic Unionist Party (DUP).
James Molyneaux: Leader, official Unionist Party.
David Trimble: New leader of the Ulster Unionists.
Combined Loyalist Military Command: Consists of the following Unionist paramilitary groups:
Ulster Freedom Fighters (UFF).
Ulster Volunteer Force (UVF).
Red Hand Commandos.
The Unionist groups tend to have less organization and to attack more indiscriminately as bands of roving gunmen.

BRITISH

John Major: Prime Minister.
Sir Patrick Mayhew: Northern Ireland Secretary.
Malcolm Rifkind: Defense Secretary.

REPUBLIC OF IRELAND

Albert Reynolds: Former Irish Taoiseach (Prime Minister), Head of *Fianna Fail* party.
John Burton: Irish Taoiseach, Head of *Fine Gael* party.
Dick Spring: Irish Tanaiste (Deputy Prime Minister) also, Irish Foreign Minister and Head of Irish Labor party.

UNITED STATES

William Clinton: President of The United States of America.
Al Gore: Vice President Of the United States of America.

Anthony Lake: National Security Adviser.

Nancy Soderberg: National Security Council Expert on Ireland.

Jean Kennedy Smith: American Ambassador to Ireland and sister of Senator Ted Kennedy.

Former Senator George J. Mitchell: Head of the disarmament commission to be formed and report by mid-January.

APPENDIX C. ANGLO-IRISH AGREEMENT

The contents of the twelve articles in the Anglo Irish Agreement taken from The Irish Troubles, by J. Bowyer Bell, p.705.

Article One recognized that the change in constitutional status of Northern Ireland, which was not desired presently, could only come by agreement and the subsequent legislative arrangements then necessary.

Article Two indicated that the context was British-Irish Intergovernmental Council, BIIC, that the Irish government might put forward proposals but that there would be no derogation of sovereignty.

Article Three noted details of the BIIC, that it would meet regularly and have a secretariat.

Article Four was crucial, indicating the aims for the conference as a framework to accommodate the two traditions, to promote peace and stability and prosperity, to devolve power on the basis of a widespread acceptance, and , in the language of the text, to accept modalities of bringing devolution about--the Irish government would propose schemes on behalf of interests of the minority community.

Article Five to Ten listed the concerns and functions of the BIIC-- that included matters that the Irish government could put forward--human rights and elections, flags and discrimination and possible bill of rights, the composition of various bodies, including the Police Authority and Police Complaints Board; aspects of security, legal matters including the possibility of mixed courts in both jurisdictions; and cross-border security, economic, and social matters.

Article Eleven called for a review after three years if requested.

Article Twelve reiterated the possibility of an interparliamentary link between London and Dublin, first suggested in 1981.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center 2
8725 John J. Kingman Rd., STE 0944
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia 22060-6218
2. Library, Code 13 2
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey California 93943-5101
3. Professor Cynthia Levy 1
Department of National Security Affairs
Code 38(NS/LC)
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey California 93943-5101
4. Professor Bertrand Patenaude 1
Department of National Security Affairs
Code 38(NS/PA)
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey California 93943-5101
5. Professor James Wirtz 1
Department of National Security Affairs
Code 38(NS/WZ)
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey California 93943-5101
6. Alice Hofmann 1
156 Fairview Ave.
Bayport, N.Y. 11705